

THE HISTORY OF THE
BOOK OF
COMMON PRAYER

N. DIMOCK.

DUKE
UNIVERSITY



DIVINITY SCHOOL
LIBRARY

2⁰⁰

THE HISTORY
OF THE
BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER

WORKS BY THE REV. N. DIMOCK.

MEMORIAL EDITION.

With an Introductory Note by the BISHOP OF DURHAM.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SACRAMENTS IN RELATION TO THE DOCTRINES OF GRACE, AS CONTAINED IN THE SCRIPTURES, TAUGHT IN OUR FORMULARIES, AND UPHELD BY OUR REFORMERS. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d. net.

CHRISTIAN UNITY: Some Considerations on the Subject. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d. net.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER: Two Lectures. With an Appendix on the Augmentation Theory. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d. net.

OUR ONE PRIEST ON HIGH; or, the Present Sacerdotal Function of Christ in Heaven: What it is not, and What it is. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d. net.

THE HISTORY OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER IN ITS BEARING ON PRESENT EUCHARISTIC CONTROVERSIES. With a Preface Touching on the Ancillary Evidence of Contemporary Writings and Doings. Crown 8vo, 2s. net.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF SACERDOTIUM, AS CONTAINED IN THE SCRIPTURES AND TAUGHT IN OUR FORMULARIES. Being a Paper read at the Annual Meeting of the South-Eastern Clerical and Lay Church Alliance, held at Dover, 2nd June, 1897. Crown 8vo, 2s. net.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.,

LONDON, NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA.

VOX LITURGIÆ ANGLICANÆ

THE HISTORY
OF THE
BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER
IN ITS BEARING ON
PRESENT EUCHARISTIC CONTROVERSIES

BY THE
REV. N. DIMOCK, M.A.

MEMORIAL EDITION
WITH AN INTRODUCTORY NOTE BY
THE RT. REV. H. C. G. MOULE, D.D.
BISHOP OF DURHAM

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA

1910

Div. S.

264.03
D 5824

AUCKLAND CASTLE,

BISHOP AUCKLAND,

December 21st, 1909.

THIS Memorial Edition is inscribed to the memory of the Reverend Nathaniel Dimock, M.A., by friends and disciples to whom his name is at once dear and venerable. In him the grace of God combined in perfect harmony a noble force and range of mental power, an unshaken fidelity to conscience and Revelation, and a spirit beautiful with humility, peace, and love.

“Remember your guides, who spoke unto you the Word of God, whose faith follow, considering the end of their walk of life.”

H. DUNELM.

NOTICE.

IN the following publication an attempt is made to correct what appear to be certain prevalent misconceptions concerning our Book of Common Prayer.

The writer will be thankful if it may lead to a fuller investigation of an interesting and not unimportant subject.

If he should unhappily be found to have led the way to misconceptions himself, he will be thankful to have his errors corrected.

For certain valuable additions to the Notes he is indebted to the courtesy and accurate learning of J. T. Tomlinson, Esq., who kindly sent some criticisms on these chapters as they appeared in the "Churchman" of 1896.

Others also have kindly contributed their aid in the way of friendly remarks and observations. To *all* the writer desires to acknowledge his obligations, while on *none* would he cast any measure of responsibility for statements and opinions, the burden of which it is for himself alone to bear.

PREFACE.

THE position taken up in this publication is the same as that which I maintained many years ago in No. VII. of “Papers on the Doctrine of the Church of England concerning the Eucharistic Presence”.

I there endeavoured to show, and I believe I did show, that the history of our Prayer-Book makes it abundantly clear that its Eucharistic doctrine was, and is, the doctrine of the “Reformed.”

But since the date of that publication additional light has been thrown on the subject by the diligent labours of others. And more recent investigations have been tending to make this argument from the history of our Liturgy yet more cogent and convincing.

The argument, indeed, from *absence* of other doctrine, might no doubt be held to be sufficient. And in view of the declaration of our Canon LVII., that “the doctrine . . . of the Lord’s Supper is so sufficiently set down in the Book of Common Prayer . . . as nothing can be added unto it that is material and necessary,” it ought to carry the greatest weight. But the fact that the *absence* is the *absence of omission*, and of omission with an unquestionable design of clearly eliminating what might possibly be understood as teaching *more* than this,

ought in fairness to be acknowledged as adding immensely to the force of this evidence.

But, indeed, I believe history will be found to testify abundantly that it was felt, and well understood, in England and out of England, that the Church of England had clearly taken her stand among the Churches of the "Reformed," and had rejected the teaching of the Lutheran doctrine of the Presence.

Let the reader, for example, read the words of Archbishop Grindal (then Bishop of London) addressed to the magistrates of Frankfort in the year 1561. He writes to implore a merciful consideration for the Dutch Protestants there, who were in fear of being expelled from that city, because (as belonging to the "Reformed") they could not accept the teaching of the Augsburg Confession on the Eucharist. And thus he writes: "Nos in nostris Ecclesiis, quanquam *eandem* cum Flandrensis istis *doctrinam* et apud nos professi sumus, et etiamnum *hic profitemur*, nunquam tamen aliquem qui cum Lutheru sentiret, si pacifice se gereret, pro hæretico aut nefario homine persecuti fuimus" (Remains, P.S., p. 248).

Add to this the testimony of Archbishop Whitgift (then Master of Trinity College, Cambridge): "Mr. Martyr nameth the popish things which the Lutherans observe to be the REAL PRESENCE, images, all the popish apparel which they used in their Mass (for so doth he mean), which THIS CHURCH HAS REFUSED. . . . God be thanked, Religion is wholly *reformed*, even to the quick, in this Church" (Works, P.S., vol. iii., p. 550).¹

¹ It is important to observe that this is in answer to the following statement of Cartwright: "Peter Martyr, upon the Tenth Chapter of the

Let the reader also be asked to read the following extracts from the speech (as given in Hospinian) which Elizabeth's ambassador made, under her instructions, with reference to the *Formula concordiae*: “Consultum duxit [Serenissima Angliæ Regina] Me ad Celsitudines vestras mittere . . . ut intercederem . . . ne talis aliqua Censura et Conventus fiant, per quos non tantum paucis in Germania Ecclesiis, sed, omnibus, quæ sunt in Regno Galliæ, Angliæ, Hiberniæ, Scotiæ, Poloniæ, Hungariæ, Helvetiæ, et aliis multis locis præjudicium fiat, quæ a dicta formula diversum sentiunt” (“Concordia Discors,” in Works, vol. v., p. 147. Geneva, 1678. See also pp. 148b and 149a).

A little later on, the speech, touching on the effects which would follow the acceptance of the Formula, declares: “Omnes ecclesias perstringet, quæ diversum a nova hac Formula sentiunt; hoc est, ecclesiæ omnes Anglicæ, Hibernicæ, Gallicæ, Scoticæ, Polonicæ, Helveticæ, inauditæ, et immerentes, et absque ulla legitima causæ cognitione condemnabuntur” (p. 148).

Still more important it is to observe the prominent position taken by the English ambassadors in the assembly of the “Reformed” held at Frankfort on Maine (1577) for the purpose of thwarting the designs of the Lutheran party. (See Hospinian, “Concordia Discors,” in Works, vol. v., pp. 143-145.)

The reader may be asked specially to observe the Second Book of Kings, saith, ‘The Lutherans must take heed lest, whilst they cut off many popish errors, they follow Jehu by retaining also many popish things. For they defend still the real presence in the bread of the Supper, and images, and vestments, etc.’; and saith that ‘religion must be wholly reformed to the quick.’”

petition to Elizabeth, as to the nursing-mother of the Churches, and holding the highest place among the “Reformed” Princes, to send a theologian to assist in drawing up a common confession of faith for all the Reformed Churches. Hospinian says: “Omnibus placuit I. Ut Illustrissimus Princeps Dux Casimirus totius Conventus nomine humiliter rogetur ne gravetur Serenissimæ Reginæ Angliæ, velut primariæ Ecclesiarum Nutrici atque fautrici, et quæ primum inter Principes, puriorem religionem profitentes, locum obtinet, scribere, et ab ejus Majestate petere, ut ad hujus Confessionis conscriptionem, Theologum unum in Germaniam mittere dignetur, qui una cum aliis, huic tam necessario operi incumbat” (Works, vol. v., p. 145a. Geneva, 1678).

Parsons says that Elizabeth accounted Zwingle and his followers as *saints* (“Responsio ad Edictum Reg. Angl.,” p. 165. Rome, 1593), and that the English regarded the doctrine of Zwingle, Ecolampadius, and Calvin as the truth of the Gospel (*Ibid.*, p. 292, “Quam Angli pro veritate Evangelica tuentur”). And he sets down the Lutheran condemnation of the “Reformed” (the *Secta Zuingliana*) as the “Lutheranorum judicium de religione Anglicana” (p. 292, margin).

In 1562 Bishop Jewel wrote to Peter Martyr: “In dogmatis prorsus omnia ad vivum resecavimus, et ne unguem quidem latum absumas a doctrina vestrâ” (“Zurich Letters,” P.S., 1st Series, App., p. 59).

In the following year, December 13, 1563, Bishop Horne of Winchester, writing to H. Bullinger, declared: “Nos per totam Angliam eandem habemus ecclesias-

ticam doctrinam, quam vos." And later on, in the same letter, he says: "E libris, quos in secundis commemo-
ras literis, accepi tres ejusdem argumenti contra Brentii
Ubiquitatem; quam materiam suscepit, ut tu cupis,
Anglus quidem, eandemque ope Divina acriter ac diserte
tractabit, ut omnibus innotescat, idem Anglos cum
Tigurinis in ea re sentire" (*Ibid.*, p. 81).

In 1566 Archbishop Grindal (then Bishop of London) wrote to H. Bullinger (alluding to the controversy concerning the habits, which he and others disliked): "Optimum judicavimus non deserere ecclesias propter
ritus non adeo multos, eosque per se non impios, præ-
sertim quum pura Evangelii doctrina nobis integra ac
libera maneret, in qua ad hunc usque diem (utcunque
multi multa in contrarium moliti sunt) cum vestris
ecclesiis vestraque Confessione nuper edita plenissime
consentimus" (*Ibid.*, p. 100).

The following extract from Strype will furnish additional evidence on this point: "On a sudden, September 27, 1579, on Sunday at one of the Clock, the Clergy of the City were called unto the Bishop's Palace, where forty of them appeared: Then the Bishop, the Dean of Paul's being present and assistant, told them the Occasion of his sudden calling for them, was to admonish them of two things chiefly. The former was of one *Andreas Jacobus*, a *Dutch-man*, and, as it seems, a Minister of the Strangers' Church in London: who was a *Lutheran*, or an *Ubiquitary*, as they now stiled them, who were for the Real Presence: and had caused great quarrels among the Strangers, Preachers. He warned them to take heed, how they gave ear to the Sophistical

Arguments of him, or any such like" (Strype's "Aylmer," pp. 62, 63. London, 1701).

In 1576 Bishop Horne wrote to Rodolph Gualter: "Ut a parvula [Regina] papismum semper est abominata, ita etiam Lutheranismum, qui multum inturbat Christianismum, nunquam est admissura" ¹ (*Ibid.*, p. 189).

¹ This statement is deserving of some special attention. To some it may perhaps seem startling, and others will probably regard it as an exaggeration. Yet the writer is one whose veracity is above suspicion, and whose opportunities of information were undoubtedly good. The words are the words of a man who speaks as of that which he knows.

It should be observed that the letter was written in the sixth year after the "Brutum fulmen" of Pope Pius V., which was the "Damnatio et excommunicatio Elizabethæ Reginæ Angliæ," in which it was charged against her: "Missæ sacrificium, preces, jejunia, ciborum dilectum, coelibatum, ritusque Catholicos abolevit; libros, manifestam hæresim continentes, toto regno proponi, impia mysteria et instituta ad Calvini præscriptum a se suscepta et observata, etiam et subditis servari mandavit" (see Cardwell's "Documentary Annals," vol. i., pp. 329, 330).

It is true that at the commencement of her reign she may have manifested, as the result of her educational surroundings, a favourable view of the Augsburg Confession (see Soames's "Elizabethan Hist.," p. 580). And Jewel wrote of her to Peter Martyr, April 28, 1559: "Nostra enim nunc cogitat fœdus Smalcaldicum" ("Zur. Letters," i., App., p. 11). It is true also (1) that the exceeding difficulties of her position, and the very cautious prudence of herself and her councillors (see Jewel's Letter in "Zur. Letters," i., p. 18, and "Litur. Eliz.," p. x), led very naturally to a course of policy which aimed at being (as far as well might be) conciliatory towards those who were not prepared to accept the doctrine of the "Reformed" (see Burnet, "Hist. of Reformation," vol. ii., Pref.); and (2) that her persistence in retaining the crucifix in her chapel (which was following a Lutheran precedent) was the cause of grave and just offence to the "Reformed" generally; and, further (3), that her determination in the matter of the surplice and "habits," to which may be added her dislike of the Church of Geneva (see "Zur. Letters," ii., p. 131) and its influence among the Puritans, gave occasion to some (specially to those disposed to look to Reformed Churches abroad as models) to dread the influence of a "Lutherano-Papistical Ministry" (see "Zur. Letters," i., pp. 169, 177).

On September 1, 1583, Elizabeth herself wrote a letter to the authorities of Zurich, Berne, Basle, and

But, notwithstanding all this (and more than this), and her aversion from the opposition of Puritans and the obstinacy of extremists, there seems to be fairly good evidence that the Queen was not (persistently at least) a Lutheran in the doctrine of the Eucharist.

Her high esteem for John a Lasco, and her desire to have P. Martyr in England after reading his treatise on the Eucharist, are hardly to be reconciled with the notion of her holding Lutheran doctrines (see Gorham's "Reformation Gleanings," pp. 382, 392, 402). Indeed, Bishop Horne's statement in the text might be strongly confirmed by the testimony of other Reformed writers.

Rogers, in his work on the Articles, wrote (Pref., pp. 6, 7): "Lady Elizabeth was placed in the royal throne; superstition was expelled, and true religion again, to the singular comfort and multiplication of God's people in this kingdom, very solemnly restored. . . . Hereupon wrote Beza from Geneva: *Doctrinæ puritas viget in Anglia pure et sincere.* . . . Zanchius from Strasborough: *Per hanc reginam factam.* ('By her'—meaning Queen Elizabeth's—'coming to the Crown, God again hath restored His doctrine and true worship.') And Danaeus: 'The whole compass of the world hath never seen anything more blessed, nor more to be wished, than is her government.'"

And Bullinger, writing in 1572, says: "Superat hæc virgo Deo dilecta (omnium testimonio bonorum) omnes quotquot nunc regnant reges mares per orbem, sapientia, modestia, clementia, et tum etiam justitia, rerumque gerendarum dexteritate et admiranda felicitate; unde sane pii omnes per universa regna sese consolantur, et in vera religione confirmant, quod perspicue cernunt Christum Dominum cultrici suæ adesse tam potenter, ipsamque gloria et omnigenis virtutibus heroicis divinisque anteferre principibus" (see Whitgift's Works, P.S., vol. iii., p. 496).

With this may be compared the following from Hooker: "That which especially concerneth ourselves, in the present matter we treat of, is the state of reformed religion, a thing at her coming to the Crown even raised as it were by miracle from the dead; a thing which we so little looked to see that even they which behold it done scarcely believed their own senses at the first beholding" ("Eccles. Pol.," Book IV., chap. xix., § 7; Works, vol. i., p. 488. Edit. Keble).

Even the Papist Sanders, though he seems rather to aim at fastening something of a Lutheran *odium* on Elizabeth's proceedings (see pp. 293, 294, 302, 303), wrote thus: "Tremendum missæ sacrificium, cum reliquo omni Sanctissimo ritu precandi, et sacramenta administrandi abolet; et

Schaffhausen, in which she speaks of the people of Geneva as having “the same enemies as yourselves;

nova sacra, ceremonias, precesque in lingua vulgari ad normam maxime Lutheranorum (hoc solo excepto, quod imagines sacras sustulerit) præscribit, licet fides Calvini, magis tum, et deinceps, ab ipsis legislatoribus eorumque ministris et sectatoribus sit approbata” (“De Schismate Angl.,” p. 279. Ingolstadt, 1587).

Moreover, Neal, who looks on all her proceedings with a Puritan eye, and desires to represent Elizabeth as almost a Papist in respect of her fondness for ceremonial observances, acknowledges that the *doctrines* she approved were those of the foreign Reformed Churches (see “History of Puritans,” vol. i., p. 383).

Too much, I think, has sometimes been made of Strype’s language: “Indeed, what to think of the Queen at this time as to her religion, one might hesitate somewhat” (“Annals,” vol. i., Introd., § 1, p. 2).

It has not, perhaps, been sufficiently observed that by the words “at this time” Strype is directing attention only to quite the commencement of her reign, and is perhaps doing little more than giving expression to the doubts which many felt at that time. Mr. Hodges (“Bishop Guest,” p: 65) quotes a letter from Archbishop Potter (then Dr. Potter) desiring to have altered what Strype had said “of Queen Elizabeth’s favouring Popery, and believing the Real Presence, etc., because it is supported by the authority of Knox, a rigid Presbyterian, and the Papists, and is contradicted by others of better credit.”

But, indeed, it will be found that Strype himself has sufficiently corrected the mistaken impression which some have gathered from his saying. Thus he writes in the preface to the same volume, after quoting from Hooker and Bishop Carlton in praise of her support of the Reformed religion: “These passages concerning the Queen, together with her vigorous methods used for the overthrowing of Popery, and her frequent public declarations of her mind (apparent in the following History), are abundantly sufficient to evince how little affection she had to that Religion; however, Parsons the Jesuit would impose upon the world a different conceit of her, which hath indeed amused some observing men. But we may resolve briefly what he relates concerning her, partly into her dissembling for her life in her Sister’s reign, the rest into uncertain Hear-says and Popish Calumny.”

What is alleged of her professed belief in the Real Presence is nothing more than was professed not only by such men as Andrewes, Laud, and Heylyn, but also by such men as the Puritan Perkins, the authors of the “Harmonia Confessionum,” Dr. Owen, the great Independent divine, and

those, namely, who, on account of the purity of the Reformed religion which we profess, have conspired against

by the Puritans generally, who all alike rejected the doctrine of the Roman and Lutheran "Real Presence."

Bishop Forbes's argument ("On Articles," vol. ii., p. 580) had been used before by one who urged that "Dr. Heylyn and others have observed of this Queen that she was a zealous propugner of the Real Presence." To which this sufficient reply was given by Archbishop Wake: "Which may be very true, and yet but little to the purpose, if she propugned it in the same sense that her brother Edward VI. and the Church of England had done before, and not in the new notion imposed upon her by this author, but without any manner of proof to warrant his suggestion" (in Gibson's "Preservative," vol. x., p. 64).

In 1588 was published "A Preparation to the Holy Communion." . . . This book claims to have been written "by a godly and learned Father of the Church of England, for the use of our late dread Sovereign Lady Elizabeth" (title-page of the edition of 1701). It teaches, indeed, very plainly the doctrine of the Real Presence very much as our Catechism does. But it is the Real Presence not of Roman or Lutheran theology, but of the "Reformed."

For a further vindication of the doctrine of Queen Elizabeth and of the Church of England during her reign, see "Papers on the Eucharistic Presence," pp. 567-570.

It may be added that in the year 1559 the "notable Paper of Address" was presented to the Queen by the divines "that assembled and sat for Reformation," giving reasons "why it was not convenient that the Communion should be ministered at an altar." Among these reasons we find the following: "Whereas your Majesty's principal purpose is utterly to abolish all the errors and abuses used about the Lord's Supper, especially to root out the Popish Mass and all superstitious opinions concerning the same, the altar is a means to work the contrary." "It may please your Grace also to call to remembrance that the greatest learned men of the world . . . have in these *Reformed* Churches . . . always taken away the altars; *only Luther and his Churches* have retained them. In the which Churches be some other imperfections." To this address the Queen "yielded to the taking away the altars, as by the effect it appeared" (see Strype's "Annals," i., chap. xii., pp. 160-163. London, 1725).

In vain did the Bishop of Durham "tell the Queen what he thought about these affairs." In vain he appealed to documents of Henry VIII. "against the heresies now received." "It was all" (as the Bishop of Aquila reported to Philip) "of no avail." (See "Spanish Calendar,"

the lives of all those who profess the Gospel." She adds: "In proportion as they [the enemies] are more active in this one object, namely, that they may divide us asunder, they render us more vigilant in cherishing and promoting concord among ourselves" ("Zurich Letters," ii., p. 319).

And in the year 1600 the Queen received a letter from the state of Zurich, which concludes with these words: "Deum rogamus et rogabimus, ut serenissimam tuam Majestatem, ecclesiæ orthodoxæ nutritiam laudatissimam et fidei veræ defensatricem fortissimam, omni bono cumulare, ab omni malo et præsertim antichristi technis defendere, ac piis consiliis benedicere pergit, ad nominis sui gloriam propagandam, et ecclesiæ, cuius florentissimum Angliæ regnum ceu hujus nostri seculi *vera Sarepta est*, salutem tuendam" ("Zurich Letters," ii., App., p. 201).

In 1588 Whitaker—concerning whom Bishop Hall asked, "Who ever saw him without reverence, or heard him without wonder?"—then Master of St. John's College, Cambridge, and Regius Professor of Divinity, wrote: "All our expositions should accord with the analogy of faith. . . . Now, the analogy of faith is nothing else but the constant sense of the general tenor of Scripture in those clear passages of Scripture where the meaning labours under no obscurity. . . . The Lutherans adopt

p. 89. See also Wriothesley's "Chronicle," vol. ii., p. 146, and Machyn's "Diary," pp. 208, 399.)

It may also be added that the pervert, Alexander White, in his "Schismatis Anglicani Redargutio" (Lovanii, 1661), recognises the Eucharistic doctrine of the English Church as the doctrine of the Sacramentaries (p. 282).

another interpretation, namely, the Body of Christ is under the bread, and hence infer their doctrine of consubstantiation. . . . The analogy of faith teaches that Christ had a body like to ours. Now, such a body can neither lie hid under the accidents of bread, nor be along with the bread. . . . The analogy of faith teaches that Christ is in heaven; therefore He is not in the bread or with the bread" ("Disputation on Scripture," pp. 472, 473, P.S. Edit.).

In 1607 Thomas Rogers published his work entitled "The Catholic Doctrine of the Church of England." He was chaplain to Archbishop Bancroft, and in a long preface dedicated the work to him. The book, moreover, came forth bearing on its title-page in conspicuous type these words, "Perused, and by the lawful authority of the Church of England allowed to be public." According to Wood, the work had already appeared, under a different title, in the reign of Elizabeth. It had then been published in two parts: the first in 1579, "Allowed by Authority," a second edition of which appeared in 1585. It was dedicated to Bishop Scambler of Norwich. The second part was published in 1587, and dedicated to Sir Christopher Hatton, the Lord Chancellor. The Book, as published in 1607, professes on its title to be "the faith, doctrine, and religion professed and protected in the Realm of England and dominions of the same, expressed in Thirty-nine Articles." Under Article XXVIII. we find set down as among "the adversaries unto this truth" "the Synusiasts, or Ubiquitaries, which think the Body of Christ so is present in the Supper as His said Body, with bread and wine, by one and the same

mouth, at one and the same time, of all and every communicant, is eaten corporally and received into the belly" (p. 289, P.S. Edit.).

I might add the fact that the Catechism of Edward VI. (1553) was authoritatively set forth for the use of all schoolmasters by letters patent, and the King's Injunction—that Jewel's "Apology" (in the words of Bishop Randolph) "was always understood to speak the sense of the whole Church." It is recognised as "The Apology of the Church of England" in our 30th Canon. It is quoted by Hooker ("Eccl. Pol.", II., 6), as "The English Apology." It was regarded as our "Apologia vere gemmea" by Bishop Andrewes. By three successive sovereigns, and four successive Archbishops, it was ordered to be chained up in all parish churches throughout England and Wales.

I might also add the fact that Bullinger's Decades were more than recommended by authority for the study of the less learned among the clergy—that the use of Nowell's Catechism was enjoined by the canons of 1571 (which also sanctioned Foxe's "Acts and Monuments"), and that schoolmasters are required to teach it by the 79th Canon of 1603, that the Catechisms of Calvin and Bullinger were ordered by statute to be used in the University of Oxford, and that besides these the Catechisms of *Œcolampadius* and *Leo Judæ* were extensively used in our English Universities.

It is surely needless to add that all these works give no uncertain sound in the matter of the Sacramentarian Controversy. None who study them will question that they speak distinctly the language of the "Reformed."

And can any reasonably doubt that, in their connection with our English history, they bear important witness to the “Reformed” character of the doctrine of our Church?

To these may very well be added the witness of the “Reformatio Legum.” Nothing can be clearer than its condemnation of the doctrine of Luther, and of the Real Presence in or under the elements. It has never, indeed, been made authoritative. But it was revised and approved by Parker, and made public by his consent, and it affords good historical evidence of the Eucharistic doctrine which our ecclesiastical authorities desired and designed to sanction and authorize. It has been said by Dr. Cardwell to represent “the state and condition of the Church of England in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, when the Reformation may be said to have been completed” (see Cardwell’s *Preface*, pp. x, xi).

It may, perhaps, be alleged that this evidence pertains only to a time when the Church of England was in its lowest depths of doctrinal degradation. It may be well, therefore, to observe that up to the time of Archbishop Laud (whose objection appears to have rested on the “Calvinian rigors of Predestination, the parity of ministers,” and the power ascribed by Pareus to “inferior magistrates”) it was customary, in the issue of “briefs” or “letters patent” authorizing collections¹ for Reformed Churches abroad, to speak of those

¹ I am not aware that these authorized collections were ever made for any other than strictly “Reformed” Communions, though in the matter of charitable alms the Lutheran error might possibly have been out of sight. It should be borne in mind that there was a general disposition

Churches as holding “the true religion which we together with them professed, and which we are all bound in conscience to maintain.” (See Heylyn’s “Cyprianus Anglicus,” pp. 305, 306; and Prynne’s “Canterbury’s Doom,” pp. 391-394.)

Thus, in 1582 letters were written from the Council to all the Bishops to promote a liberal charity to assist the citizens of Geneva (which had been “a nursery unto God’s Church”), then threatened by the Duke of Savoy under the influence of “the Pope and his associates, confederate against those of the religion reformed.” And Archbishop Grindal, in his letter recommending the cause to the Bishops, says that “the consideration of this pitiful relief, tending to the defence of so *notable and sincere a Church*, dangerously sought and distressed by many mighty enemies—in truth, common to all such as love and tender the maintenance of the Gospel—doth

among some of the Reformed to make the most of the *agreement* among Protestants, and to desire that as little as possible might be made of the point (which in their view was only a question of the *mode*), on account of which the Lutherans stood aloof (see “Eucharistic Presence,” p. 748). There were also among the so-called Lutherans those who held very lightly by the Lutheran doctrine of the Presence, and regarded it as not a matter of the faith. There was, indeed, little of important difference from the Reformed in the Lutheranism of the Crypto-Calvinists.

When Archbishop Laud made his objection, the collection was for the exiled ministers of the Palatinate, which (though the Elector Lewis had, in 1576, restored for a while the Lutheran doctrine) had since obtained a prominent position among the “Reformed” Churches. And his objection must not be understood as signifying any fundamental doctrinal difference in his view. In his “Conference with Fisher” (§ 14, p. 41. Oxford, 1839) Laud said: “Nor yet speak I this as if other Protestants did not agree with the Church of England in the chiefest doctrines and in the main exceptions which they jointly take against the Roman Church, as appears by their several confessions.”

more peculiarly and nearly touch and concern us of the State of the Church" (see Strype's "Life of Grindal," pp. 280, 281).

Again, in 1603, when the Duke of Savoy had surprised the town with a view "to establish the Catholic religion there," King James "resolved to promote a collection for them among all his subjects. He considered them as deserving well of the common cause of religion, and for harbouring many voluntary exiles as had fled there for that cause, and particularly those of the English nation." And Archbishop Whitgift, in his commendatory letter to the Bishops, spoke of the collection as "for the relief of a city which maintained the Gospel, and that for professing thereof endured these troubles" (see Strype's "Life of Whitgift," chap. xxx., pp. 563, 564). The Archbishop's letter may be seen in Cardwell's "Documentary Annals," vol. ii., pp. 48-50.

It is also specially to be observed that the Canon VII. of 1640, while commanding the practice of "doing reverence and obeisance" at "coming in and going out" of churches, disclaims "any intention to exhibit any religious worship to the communion-table, the east, or church, or anything therein contained in so doing, or to perform the said gesture in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist upon any opinion of a *corporal presence* of the Body of Jesus Christ on the holy table or in mystical elements." And the same Canon speaks of "the idolatry committed in the Mass" (see Cardwell's "Synodalia," vol. i., pp. 404, 406, and compare especially Crakanthorpe as quoted in my "Eucharistic Presence," pp. 472, 473).

This is good testimony to the “Reformed” character of the Church of England in the matter of Eucharistic doctrine from the extreme party of anti-Puritan theology.

But I will add the distinct testimony of Archbishop Laud himself, in which, I venture to say, he is but uttering the voice of Laudian theology as a whole. “All sides,” he says, “agree in *the faith of the Church of England*, that in the most blessed Sacrament the worthy receiver is by his faith made spiritually partaker of the true and real Body and Blood of Christ truly and really, and of all the benefits of His passion. Your Roman Catholics add a manner of this His presence, transubstantiation, which many deny, and the Lutherans a manner of this Presence, consubstantiation, which more deny. If the argument be good, then, even for this consent, it is safer communicating with the Church of England than with the Roman or Lutheran, because all agree in this truth, not in any other opinion” (“Conference with Fisher,” p. 241. Oxford, 1839).

The reader may also be asked to take account of the following extract from the Life of Bishop Frampton, of Gloucester, who was deprived as a Nonjuror in 1689. During the time that he was acting as Chaplain at Aleppo, some German merchants of the Lutheran persuasion “desired to be admitted as Communicants with his Congregation, to which he reply’d that there was a great difference between them and us in the Doctrine of the Sacrament, which they confessed, yet, as one of them observed, it was not such as obliged them to break communion, it being, says he, only of the modus,

which ought not to be made a term of communion" (edited by Rev. T. Simpson Evans. Longmans and Co.).

It may also be observed that in 1662 the well-known Divine of the French Reformed Church, Moses Amyraldus, wrote, "Angli qui inter nos in Gallia peregrinantur, pariter sese moribus, institutis, disciplinæ legibus, et cæremoniis nostris accommodant, ut suam pietatem et utriusque *Ecclesiæ consensionem testificantur*." (Quoted from Goode's "Brotherly Communion," p. 29.)

These are only a few trifling, incidental testimonies, but they afford evidence of a kind which, added to more substantial witness, carries with it much weight.

It may, no doubt, be quite fairly and truly said of some of these testimonies, that one and another, taken alone, have no very high evidential value. But this does not stand in the way of our acknowledging that their cumulative force is not inconsiderable.

They are adduced to bear witness to the fact that the character which I have claimed for our Liturgy is the character which was generally understood as belonging to the Reformed Church of England.

I have in view here only the doctrine of the Eucharist. And as I have maintained that everything beyond the doctrine of the "Reformed" has been deliberately eliminated from the teaching of our Prayer-Book, so I venture to express my conviction that not the doctrine of the Mass-Sacrifice alone, but the teaching of the Roman and Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence stands condemned by our Articles, and was meant and understood to be condemned, not by the Reformers

alone, but by such men as the Episcopal Commissioners at the Savoy Conference, and by all who were not wilful "mistakers" of their obvious and natural meaning. Our Articles and our Service-Book both speak the same language. And I think I am not going too far in stating that that language was well understood (in former ages) to be the language of the "Reformed."

It is, of course, not a thing to be wondered at, if, in course of time, there arose something like a coldness or lack of sympathy between the Church of England and the Reformed Churches of the Continent. Indeed, the wonder is rather that this feeling was not more often and more strongly manifested. It was only natural that the sympathies of the French and Swiss Reformers should be drawn to the side of the Puritans, who were constantly appealing to their examples, and fretting under the restraint of authority which lent a deaf ear to those who disliked the English ceremonies, and advised the excision of the so-called *tolerabiles ineptiæ* from the Book of Common Prayer. And, later, the ascendancy of the high-handed Laudian policy must have been an offence to many.

But then, as regards the early Puritans, it must be remembered that there was a well-understood agreement between them and their opponents on matters of doctrine. The questions in controversy were questions, not of doctrine, but of order and discipline and ceremonies.¹

¹An exception should, however, be made of the question concerning the observance of the Lord's Day, which began to gender contention towards the close of the reign of Elizabeth, and has been rightly set down as "the first disagreement upon any point of doctrine" (see Marsden's "History of the Early Puritans," p. 240).

This agreement was fully recognised by such Churchmen as Bishop Andrewes. He said, in his answer to Bellarmine : “ *Distinguat itidem, inter res fidei, in quibus ne ii quidem, quos Puritanos appellat (nisi plus etiam quam Puritani sint) a nobis, nec nos ab illis dissentimus ; et disciplinæ res ; quam aliam ab Ecclesiæ priscâ formâ commenti sunt* ” (“ *Ad Bell. Resp.*,” pp. 290, 291. Oxford, 1851).

And so as regards the Reformed Churches on the Continent, notwithstanding occasional causes of offence in what may have been regarded as the stiffness of the attitude of the English Church, it was felt and acknowledged on both sides that there was a happy accord in matters of *doctrine*. This accord was also recognised by such men as Bishop Andrewes, who, writing on behalf of those “ *qui reformatam Religionem profitemur*,” declared : “ *Fidem autem unam retinere nos tamen Confessionum nostrarum Harmonia satis ipsa per se loquitur* ” (*ibid.*, p. 36).

No doubt the Bishop had in view the Churches of the Reformation as a whole, not excluding the Lutheran¹

¹ It was doubtless the controversies concerning the Eucharist, and the stiffness of the Lutherans in their doctrine of the Real Presence, that the Bishop has in view in the context. The entire sentence reads thus : “ *Atqui, inter nos ipsos, qui reformatam Religionem profitemur, utcunque quosdam ingenii fervor paulo abripit longius, et (ut in paroxysmo fieri assolet) augentur res supra modum ; tamen lites non sunt, quales videt Cardinalis per somnium : nec tales etiam, quin, ubi deferbuit calor ille, commode conciliari posse spes sit. Fidem autem unam retinere nos tamen Confessionum nostrarum Harmonia satis ipsa per se loquitur.* ” It may be well to observe that in this passage the Bishop is just expressing the sentiments found in the Preface to the “ *Harmonia Confessionum*,” where it deals with the subject “ *quod ad illam de Cœna Domini controversiam attinet.* ”

from the general agreement, but including them as in general concord with the “Reformed,” and as affording hope of being brought from their persistent aloofness, as regards one particular, into a truer harmony with their brethren ; just as the “*Harmonia Confessionum*,” to which he appeals, includes the Lutheran Confession of Augsburg, but makes it manifest that its language concerning the Lord’s Supper is accepted only as understood in the sense of the “Reformed.”¹

In truth, the Real Presence of Luther could so little be fitted into his doctrinal system, that the charity of the “Reformed” could look upon it as practically to be de-Lutheranized by Lutheranism (see “*Eucharistic Presence*,” p. 748).

Thus, for example, Bishop Davenant has shown that the “oral manducation” for which the Lutherans so strongly contended is neither *oral* nor *manducation* (if the words are to have their natural meaning) according to the teaching of the strictest Lutheranism (see his “*Ad fraternam Communione* . . . *Adhortatio*,” p. 136. Cambridge, 1640).²

¹ See “*Harmonia Confessionum*,” p. 127 (Geneva, 1581), and Hall’s “*Harmony*,” pp. 337, 338. The “*Harmonia Confessionum*” was a strictly “Reformed” publication, the work of “Reformed” divines, under “Reformed” influence, issued as a counterpoise to the Lutheran “*Concordia*” (see Hall’s Introduction, pp. xi-xvii).

² Not that there were no Lutherans whose conception of “oral manducation” was so stiffened and hardened that it refused the action of all solvent doctrines. It appears, indeed, that at one time Luther himself insisted on the real literal *mastication* of Christ’s Body in the Eucharist. (Letter to Jonas, December 16, 1534; see Schaff’s “*History of Creeds*,” p. 317.) And we are told that the Lutherans in Ansbach disputed about the question whether the Body of Christ were actually swallowed, like other food, and digested in the stomach. Brentius had favoured the

The “Harmonia” of the “Reformed” could appropriate, and did appropriate, with explanation, the language of Lutheran formularies.

But the “Concordia” of the Lutherans did not and could not appropriate the language concerning the Eucharist of any Reformed Confession. It did stigmatize and denounce the teaching of those confessions and of our Thirty-nine Articles.

And no strictly Lutheran divine of that day ever did express himself, or could express himself, concerning the “Harmonia Confessionum” as our good Bishop Andrewes expresses himself.

Of the general recognition of the doctrinal agreement among the Churches of the Reformed, including the Church of England, abundant evidence might be given (see “*Doctrine of Sacraments*,” pp. 89-91).

It may suffice here to illustrate what has been stated by quoting the authority of Augusti, who, in his “*Corpus Librorum symbolicorum qui in Ecclesia Reformatorum Authoritatem publicam obtinuerunt*” (Elberfeldi, 1827), would have excluded the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, on account of their wide difference in the matter of Church government, but for their *agreement in matters of superior moment, that is, in matters of doctrine*, among which the doctrine of the Lord’s Supper is particularly specified. Let the reader peruse

opinion that the consecrated bread, if eaten by a mouse, was as much the Body of Christ, as Christ was the Son of God in His mother’s womb and on the back of an ass. Other remarkable examples of the materialistic notions which have been at times attached to the conception of Lutheran orthodoxy may be seen in Professor Schaff’s “*History of the Creeds of Christendom*,” p. 284.

his words: “Articuli XXXIX. . . . Calvini quidem dogmata de prædestinatione et s. *cœna* exprimunt, ideoque *gratiam apud Reformatos meruerunt*; sed in decretis de regimine ecclesiastico ab institutis Calvini totiusque ecclesiæ Reformatorum prorsus abhorrent. Ex quo videmus, in hac Confessionum Collectione, ut par erat, rationem dogmaticam prævaluisse” (pp. 631, 632).

Niemayer, in his more recent and elaborate work, “Collectio Confessionum in Ecclesiis Reformatis publicatarum” (Lipsiæ, 1840), seems to know no question about including the English Articles (see p. lxxi), but he gives them a fourth place among the Confessions “quæ sunt secundi ordinis” (see pp. 537, 592, 601).

Dr. Schaff has said that “Continental Historians, both Protestant and Catholic, rank the Church of England among the Reformed Churches as distinct from the Lutheran, and her Articles are found in every collection of Reformed Confessions” (“History of Creeds,” p. 622). It should be added, however, that in the “Harmonia Confessionum” Jewel’s “Apology” is adopted as the English symbol—the Articles being only added in the Appendix of Hall’s English edition.

On the other hand (as Schaff has also observed) “the Articles have no place in any collection of Lutheran symbols.”

Shall we wonder, then, that the Church of England was invited to send her delegates to the Synod of Dort? There is no cause for wonder. But there is here good evidence of the truth I am contending for. The English delegates take their place—their recognised place—among the assembly of Divines. It is questioned by

none that it is their place—their proper place—as representatives of the Church of England in a synod of the Church of the “Reformed”¹ (see Fuller’s “Church History,” Book X., § 5).

I believe that in the rising generation of Churchmen there are many (and some who have been surrounded by adverse influences) who are desiring to look into our present controversies with a fair and dispassionate mind, and to be guided out of surrounding perplexities into the very truth of the matters in question. To such I address myself. And I make bold earnestly and humbly to ask of them to make for themselves an inquiry, and to spare no pains or diligence in its pursuit. I venture,

¹The Belgic Confession was accepted by the Synod, which gave occasion to Bishop Carleton’s protest, on behalf of the English, against “the parity of ministers”—“non ad harum ecclesiarum offensionem, sed ad nostræ Anglicanæ defensionem.” But, in the name of all the rest, he “approved *all* the points of *doctrine*” (see Fuller’s “Church History,” vol. iii., pp. 279, 280. London, 1837). The “Reformed” character of the Belgic confession is beyond doubt. It is regarded by Dr. Schaff as “the best symbolical statement of the Calvinistic system of doctrine, with the exception of the Westminster Confession (“History of Creeds,” p. 506). The valuable commentary of Desmaires (Maresius) on this confession evidently recognises the agreement of the English in the doctrine of the Lord’s Supper. He says: “Videntur hæc in parte Confessionis nostræ primi Scriptores tacite allusisse ad id quod dixisse aliquando fertur Durandus, laudante et referente ex Episcopo Eliensi Casaubono in *Responsione factâ ad Epist. Card. Perronii pro Rege Angliæ, Verbum audimus, motum sentimus, modum nescimus, præsentiam credimus*. Quidni enim Christus quamvis absens loco et corpore, præsens nobis fieret spiritu et fide, quandoquidem hæc est fidei veræ indoles, haud absimilis tubis opticis per quos remotissima objecta accedere et præsentia se nobis facere videntur, ut menti præsentia reddat, quæ alias vel loco vel tempore absentia ac dissita sunt?” (p. 531, Groningæ, 1752). See “Real Presence of Laudian Theology,” pp. 46, 47, where similar language is quoted from Cosin and others; see also “Lectures on Lord’s Supper,” pp. 38, 39, for Patristic testimony to the same effect.

moreover, to hope that their investigations may be assisted by the study of this book, which has, I trust, been written with a very true desire to clear away some prevalent misconceptions, and to guide aright those who are sincerely seeking the truth.

But let it not be supposed that I am thinking to ask that anything should be accepted as true only on my authority. What I am asking for is simply honest and careful investigation—investigation to be entered upon as a duty to which we are now very specially called, and to be conducted in a real and deep sense of responsibility.

The question I ask to have considered carefully is this—Whether it is not a true statement that the combined testimony of our Articles, our Communion Service, and our history tends to justify the assertion that the Eucharistic teaching of an extreme school of theology among us is not only a novelty in the Church of England, but a novelty which tends to obliterate the impress of her true character, and leads up to the condemnation of her own true doctrine.

If I am wrong, let me be shown to be wrong. But if I am right, let it be acknowledged that there is an urgent call to bear witness to the truth in this matter, and, through evil report or good report, to vindicate the character of our Church and the doctrines of our Reformation.

We may value highly the distinguishing features of the English Reformation, we may be thankful for its moderation, we may esteem its conservatism, we may think well of its regard for antiquity, we may esteem its desire to combine Evangelical truth and Apostolic order,

we may appreciate its care for the outward signs of reverence, and its diligent concern that all things should be done decently and in order ; but those who desire to be faithful sons and daughters of the Church of England may not, therefore, lend their hands to shift her *doctrinal* moorings, or to misrepresent the teaching of her *formularies*. We may claim for our Church to hold (in some sense) a place of her own among the Churches of the Reformation. We may quote, in support of that claim, the words of the learned Isaac Casaubon : “ *Totius Reformationis pars integerrima, ni fallor, in Angliâ est.* ” But we should beware of making the place we claim for her a place of *doctrinal* isolation. We *must* not be ashamed to claim for her pure and Apostolic teaching its true position among the Churches of the “ *Reformed*. ”

We may thankfully acknowledge our obligations to the great and intrepid Reformer of Germany, the lion-hearted witness to the truth and the power of the Gospel of Christ. We may willingly recognise to the full our indebtedness to Lutheran *formularies* and Lutheran divines. But we may not deny, in the name of the Church of England, that we hold clearly and firmly to the doctrine which comes under the severe condemnation¹ of the “ *Formula Concordiæ*, ” the “ *Concordia*

¹ See, *e.g.*, the following : “ *Rejicimus igitur atque damnamus corde et ore ut falsas et imposturæ plenas, omnes Sacramentariorum opiniones et dogmata. . . . VI. Quod corpus et sanguis Christi spiritualiter duntaxat, per fidem sumatur et participetur.* ” [Compare the words of our Art. XXVIII. : “ *Corpus Christi datur, accipitur, et manducatur in Cœnâ, tantum Cœlesti et spirituali ratione.* Medium autem quo Corpus Christi accipitur et manducatur in Cœna, *fides est.* ” And on Geste’s interpretation of this Art., see “ *Eucharistic Presence*, ” pp. 664, 665, 747.] “ . . . Rejicimus etiam hunc Errorem, cum docetur, quod infideles et impoenitentes (qui titulo duntaxat Christiani sunt, revera autem fidem vivam,

Discors”¹ of the teaching (now developed and hardened) of ubiquitarian Lutheranism. We have rejected the strange dogma of the Synusiasts ; we adhere to the doctrine of the “ Reformed.”²

I cannot, of course, but be well aware that some into whose hands this little book may fall will dislike my conclusion, and mistrust my arguments.

I venture, however, to ask of such that they will not veram et salvificam non habent) in *Cœna Domini non corpus et sanguinem Christi, sed tantum panem et vinum accipiant*” (“Concordia pia,” pp. 757-759; Lipsiæ, 1654. See also pp. 726-730). Mark the distinct repudiation of the obvious sense of our Art. XXIX.

In reading these and the other Articles condemnatory of the Sacramentaries in the “*Solida Declaratio*,” we may well be reminded of the words of Hooker : “It seemeth, therefore, much amiss that against them whom they term Sacramentaries so many invective discourses are made all running on two points, that the Eucharist is not a bare sign or figure only, and that the efficacy of His Body and Blood is not all that we receive in this sacrament. For no man, having read these books and writings which are thus traduced, can be ignorant that both these assertions they plainly confess to be most true” (“*Eccles. Pol.*,” Book V., ch. lxvii. 8 ; Works, vol. ii., p. 355, edit. Keble).

¹ See *Hospiniani, Opera, tom. v.*

² I am not, of course, meaning to imply that Lutheran views were unknown in England. Jewel wrote to Bullinger in 1567 : “*Agimus Deo gratias, qui non patitur nos inter nos hoc tempore gravioribus quæstionibus exerceri. Unus tamen quispiam e nostro numero Episcopus Gloucestrensis, in comitiis aperte et fidenter dixit, probari sibi Lutheri sententiam de Eucharistiâ; sed ea seges non erit, spero, diuturna*” (“*Zurich Letters*,” P.S. i., App., p. 110).

Other evidence might easily be adduced to show that Lutheran doctrine did gain a footing (though hardly a foothold) in England.

It is only contended that it was well understood at home, and abroad that the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist was not the doctrine of the “Reformed” Church of England.

The Bishop of Gloucester of whom Jewel makes mention was Cheney. And what we know of Cheney, in connection with the correspondence of Geste and Cecil and Parker, will be found, I believe, to afford strong confirmation of the view maintained in the text (see “*Papers on the Eucharistic Presence*,” pp. 657, 659, 671, 744-52).

hastily lay the book aside, but will give some careful attention to its study, and endeavour to weigh its evidence in the balances of truth.

I hope they will find in it nothing that is offensive, beyond the expression of convictions which have forced themselves upon me. I have endeavoured, at least, to avoid saying anything that might give offence, except what I am persuaded to be the truth, and the truth, of which all will acknowledge, that, if it be the truth, it needs to be told. And I am sincerely sorry if I have written anything that is calculated needlessly to provoke.

I venture also to give an assurance that the book has not been written in the interest of any low views of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. I should be sorry indeed to seem to be deducting anything from the great dignity of "those holy mysteries." I would desire to be among the first to reject what is commonly known as the Zwinglian doctrine of the Sacrament ("all for *significat*, nothing for *est*"). I hold to the true Real Presence as held and taught by Hooker, and Andrewes, and our great English divines, including (as regards the main features of the doctrine) those of the Laudian and Non-juring Schools of thought.¹

And I could most heartily desire that our controversies might be brought to an end by our all holding the faith in the unity of the spirit and the bond of peace, and all meeting together on the common ground of the

¹ See my two pamphlets on "The Real Presence of the Laudian Theology" and "The Theology of Bishop Andrewes." The rejection of anything like the "Real Presence" of Luther by the non-jurors is shown clearly by unmistakable evidence. See "The Real Presence of the Laudian Theology," p. 65.

truth as beautifully expressed by Hooker: "Let it therefore be sufficient for me, presenting myself at the Lord's Table, to know what there I receive from Him, without searching or inquiring of the manner how Christ performeth His promise . . . the very letter of the word of Christ giveth plain security that these mysteries do as nails fasten us to His very Cross, that by them we draw out, as touching efficacy, force, and virtue, even the blood of His gored side, in the wounds of our Redeemer we there dip our tongues, we are dyed red both within and without, our hunger is satisfied and our thirst for ever quenched. They are things wonderful which he feeleth, great which he seeth, and unheard of which he uttereth, whose soul is possessed of this Paschal Lamb and made joyful in the strength of this new wine. This bread hath in it more than the substance which our eyes behold; this cup, hallowed with solemn benediction, availeth to the endless life and welfare both of soul and body, in that it serveth as well for a medicine to heal our infirmities and purge our sins as for a sacrifice of thanksgiving. With touching it sanctifieth, it enlighteneth with belief, it truly conforms us unto the image of Jesus Christ. What these elements are in themselves it skilleth not; it is enough that to me which take them they are the body and blood of Christ, His promise in witness hereof sufficeth, His word He knoweth which way to accomplish. Why should any cogitation possess the mind of the faithful Communicant but this: O my God, Thou art true; O my soul, thou art happy!" ("Eccles. Pol.", Book V., ch. lxvii., § 12. Works, vol. ii., pp. 361, 362. Edit. Keble).

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
NOTICE	v
PREFACE touching on the Ancillary Evidence of Contemporary Writings and Doings	vii

CHAPTER I.

THE FIRST PRAYER-BOOK OF EDWARD VI.

Object stated	I, 2
I. Relation of first book of Edward to earlier service books	2
Order of Communion of 1548	3
The book of 1549 compared with the Sarum Missal	6
Conspicuous absence of: (1) Idolatry of Mass; (2) Blasphemy of Mass-sacrifice	6
But without <i>distinct</i> rejection of the Presence <i>sub speciebus</i>	6
II. In relation to the controversies of the day	7
i. Anti-Papal	7
ii. Not Lutheran. Expressions of a Lutheran sound capable of a "Reformed sense," <i>e.g.</i>	8
(1) Rubric at end of service, and prayer after administration	8, 9
(2) Consecration prayer ("to us")	10
(3) Memorial "with these Thy holy gifts"	12
iii. Not distinctly anti-Lutheran	14
iv. Comprehensive (as far as possible)	14, 17

CHAPTER II.

THE SECOND BOOK OF EDWARD VI.

I. Relation of second book of Edward to first—	
i. Designed rejection of everything having a Lutheran sound, as seen in:	18, 19
(1) Rubric at end of service	20
(2) Consecration prayer	20
(3) "In these holy mysteries"	21
This not to be set down as the work of foreign Reformers	22

	PAGE
ii. And of any approach to Mass-sacrifice, witness omission of—	24
(1) Memorial “with these Thy holy gifts”	25
(2) Names of—	
(a) Mass	26
(b) Altar	26
(3) Sacerdotal vestments	27
(4) Eastward position	27
II. In relation to the controversies of the day—	
i. It was distinctly “Reformed”	29
(1) As declared by German professor	29, 30
(2) Not therefore “Zwinglian”	30
ii. This evidenced by the history	31
iii. Our consequent duty	32
iv. Mistakes on the subject	34, 35

CHAPTER III.

SUBSEQUENT REVISIONS.—PART I.

I. In Elizabeth's reign the changes indicate a check to innovation, which was needed	36
II. In reign of Charles II. no new doctrinal character given to the book	36-38
i. The innovating party were defeated in their attempts to introduce important changes	41
ii. The innovators themselves had no desire to introduce Romish or Lutheran doctrines	42
iii. The changes in the Black Rubric involve no doctrinal change	44
(1) The Bishops at the Savoy held the doctrine of the unchanged rubric as the doctrine of the Church of England	46, 47
(2) A change in the use of language had made the change of expression desirable	49
(3) Unchanged, it might seem to condemn the teaching of eminent Reformed divines	49, 50
(4) The structure of the rubric is good evidence that the doctrinal statement is unchanged	51
(5) Such a doctrinal change would have been worthy of infamy as an attempt at public deception	52

CHAPTER IV.

SUBSEQUENT REVISIONS.—PART II. (*continued*).

	PAGE
I. The evidence against any doctrinal change in the Black Rubric confirmed by the writings of—	
i. Abraham Woodhead	53
ii. Dean Aldrich	54
iii. Archbishop Wake	55
iv. Archbishop Tenison	56
v. Archbishop Secker	57
II. Other changes made at last review	57
i. Not all in one direction	57
(1) Some displeasing to the Presbyterians, <i>e.g.</i> —	58
(a) Addition to prayer for Church Militant	61
(b) Additions tending to increase reverence	62
(2) Some concessions to their views	63
ii. Not doctrinally important	64-67
(1) Not seeds for a “Catholic” harvest	67
(2) Not detracting from the “Reformed” character of the book	68-72
iii. Not restoring what had been removed by previous revision	73

CHAPTER V.

OBSERVATIONS.

The history is important in its bearing on the results of the Oxford Movement, which—

I. However desirable in some of its aims	76-78
II. Introduced a new doctrine concerning the Eucharist	78
i. Which had been rejected at the Reformation	79
ii. And for witness against which our Reformers laid down their lives	79
III. And a new school of theology, accepting this new doctrine	81, 82
i. Would for its maintenance desire—	
(1) To change the doctrine of our Articles	82
(2) And as regards our Prayer-Book—	82
(a) To revert to the Sarum Missal	82
(b) Or (failing that) to Edward’s first book	82, 83

	PAGE
ii. Pleading the approval of—	
(i) The Act of Uniformity	83
(ii) Reformed divines	84
(iii) Churches in communion with the Church of England	84
IV. The pleadings of which have their answer—	
i. In the history of the revisions of the Prayer-Book	85
ii. Especially in the view of the second Prayer-Book of Edward VI.	86
(i) As compared with the first	86
(ii) As showing the clear design to make distinct the Reformed character of the book	86
(iii) And so making the doctrine of the book “fully perfect”.	86, 87

CHAPTER VI.

OBSERVATIONS (*continued*).

I. Importance of viewing the subject in the light of present surroundings	88, 89
II. Danger of concessions which	
i. However liturgically admissible	90
ii. Would be yielding to pressure	90
(i) In favour of doctrinal errors	90-92
(ii) The distinct exclusion of which constitutes the “full perfection” of our present book	94
III. The “Reformed” character of our Eucharistic service is what we are bound to maintain	95
i. And for this its doctrinal <i>distinctness</i> must be preserved	95
ii. Which by a return to Edward’s first book would be sacrificed	96, 98
iii. And sacrificed for the sake of those who desire “indistinctness” in order to shelter the excluded doctrine	98
IV. Our present dangers call for—	
i. Vigilance	98
ii. Speaking the truth in love	99
iii. Earnest prayer	104

APPENDIX.

NOTE A.—ON ALLEGED OBJECTIONS.

Answer to arguments from—	PAGE
1. The words “In that holy Sacrament”	110
2. The words of administration	111-113
3. The prayer of humble access	113-119
4. The word “mysteries”	119-123

NOTE B.—ON THE LANGUAGE OF THE BLACK RUBRIC.

The change of expression in the Black Rubric to be accounted for by
noting that—

1. The phrase “Real Presence” unexplained was commonly rejected by our Reformers	124
2. But sometimes accepted with explanation excluding “Cor- poral Presence”	125
3. Subsequent Divines appropriating “Real Presence” excluded “Corporal Presence”	126-128
4. The phrase “Corporal Presence,” accepted by Lutherans, was rejected by the “Reformed”	128, 129
5. The distinction was well understood and recognised by Divines engaged in the Revision	129, 130
6. And by subsequent Divines	130-133
INDEX	135

THE HISTORY OF OUR PRAYER-BOOK IN ITS BEARING ON PRESENT CONTROVERSIES.

CHAPTER I.

THE FIRST BOOK OF EDWARD VI.

THE history of the Book of Common Prayer is a subject which, in the present day, will well repay a less superficial study than is commonly accorded to it.

The present publication does not aim at anything like a minute examination of the various corrections and emendations through which the book has passed in its various revisions.

But I desire to assist those who would enter on the study of this subject by an attempt to set before them a fair and impartial view of the doctrinal character which has been impressed upon it, as seen in the light of its own history, and of the controversies through which it has had to make its way.

I must not be understood as pretending to have anything very new to say on the subject. Indeed, attention has already been directed to some of the matters which I desire now to bring into prominence. But there has been, as I am persuaded, so much of misunderstanding on the subject, that, as it seems to me, an effort may well be made to emphasize certain important lessons which certainly ought to be learnt

by all who desire to know the mind of the Church of England on some of the burning questions of our own day.

It is of the first importance to take a true view of the two editions of the Prayer-Book, which are commonly known as the first and second Liturgies of King Edward VI. And present circumstances demand that our attention should be fastened on the service for the Holy Communion.

The comparative study of this service as contained in the two books of 1549 and 1552 is full of instruction. And in order to apprehend this instruction aright, there are four questions to be asked. And to these questions it will be my endeavour, very briefly, to give a clear and sufficient answer.

These questions are as follow :

1. In what relation did the first book of Edward stand to earlier service-books ?
2. What was the doctrinal position of Edward's first book, in relation to then existing controversies ?
3. In what relation did the second book of Edward stand to the first book ?
4. What was the doctrinal position of Edward's second book ?

In the present chapter it will be necessary to confine ourselves to the first two of these questions. To answer these aright is the necessary preliminary to the profitable study of the last two questions.

For the present, then, we have to do only with the first Liturgy of King Edward VI., which, having been drawn up by a Commission which met at Windsor in May, 1548, and then, having been probably approved by Convocation (though this has been questioned), was ratified by Act of Parliament in the January following, and enjoined to be used from the feast of Whitsunday, 1549.

I. As regards the first question, it is important for us to

observe that the Sarum Missal (like the present Roman Mass-Book) contained much which may be said to bear witness against the doctrine of transubstantiation, while it also enjoined practices involving the idolatry of the Mass-worship, and prayers which might be understood as suggesting the blasphemy of the Mass-sacrifice.

Its witness against error had been received by tradition from earlier and purer days. Its idolatries had been added in comparatively recent times. They resulted naturally from modern additions to the faith, which they naturally also tended to support and establish.

In the first year of Edward's reign an Act of Parliament had passed (with the unanimous approval of Convocation) requiring that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper should be delivered to the people, and under both kinds.

Following this, on March 8, 1548, was put forth, by proclamation, an "Order of the Communion," which not only restored the cup to the laity, but also made certain interpolations in the service which were to be spoken in the vulgar tongue. These were afterwards incorporated in the service-book of 1549. They included "the comfortable words," the idea of which had doubtless been suggested by the Liturgy of Archbishop Hermann of Cologne, with whom Cranmer had had correspondence, and of whose "Simple and Religious Consultation" an English translation had been published in 1547, and a second edition in 1548, following a Latin version of 1545.

But these additions were to be made "without the varying¹

¹ Yet the last rubric for *second* consecration directs "without any elevation or lifting up."

It should be observed that the proclamation accompanying gives to this service the character of a first instalment only of further reformation to be expected. See Cardwell's "Liturgies," p. 426, and Gasquet, pp. 95,

of any other rite or ceremony in the Mass (until other order shall be provided)."¹

This first step towards reformation was by no means an unimportant one. Yet it was but one step, and a step which was professedly to be followed by other steps.² And the next step made a very much farther and bolder move in advance.

The changes effected in the first book of Edward VI. were very considerable indeed. It is right for us to view them not only from the point of view of our own further progress, but especially from the standpoint of those who were familiar only with the mediæval service of superstition.

It will then be seen clearly that the authorization of this book marks a most important epoch in the history of our Reformation.

The name of "the Mass," indeed, survived (though only as the term by which the Communion³ was "commonly

96. A somewhat similar note of promise appears to have been inserted (perhaps as an afterthought) in the book of 1549. See P.S. edit., p. 97, and Preface, iv, v; see also Gasquet's "Edward VI.," p. 234.

¹ Yet, on May 12, the Mass was sung "all in English" at Westminster (the sermon being by the King's Chaplain). At St. Paul's also, "Matten, Masse, and Evensong" were sung in English. See Wriothesley's "Chronicle," Camden Soc., ii. 2; and Tomlinson's "Great Debate," p. 6. And it is clear (as Dom Gasquet remarks, "Edward VI.," p. 147) "that before September, 1548, services were already drawn up, and in use, the main parts of which corresponded with those subsequently enforced in the Book of Common Prayer."

² It should be observed that the Royal Injunctions of 1547 (No. 19) had spoken of the King's intention to "transpose" the Liturgy. "These transpositions" (says Mr. Tomlinson, "Great Debate," p. 11), "with the omissions, naturally constituted the greatest and most important alterations complained of by the Conservatives in 1548."

³ It would be a mistake to suppose that the first Prayer-Book necessarily meant to express an approval of the term *Mass*, or desired to perpetuate its use, any more than Article XXV. meant to set a seal of approval to the use of the language whereby those five rites are "commonly called sacraments," which "are not to be counted for sacraments of

called"), but the idolatry of the Mass and the blasphemy of the Mass-sacrifice were not to be found. And how was their absence to be accounted for? Their absence was the absence of what had been conspicuously present. It was unmistakably the absence which came of determined and deliberate rejection. The design and purpose of the rejection was too obvious to be questioned. The object clearly and evidently was to lop off without sparing the "dangerous

the Gospel." Compare Article XXXI., "vulgo dicebatur," "it was commonly said." It has been said: "The word 'communion' would hardly have been understood in mediæval England, and it does not occur before the sixteenth century. The phrase 'Lord's Supper' was equally strange. Latimer tells us that, when talking to a Bishop, he 'chanced to name the Lord's Supper.' 'Tush!' said the Bishop; 'what do ye call the Lord's Supper? What *new term* is that?' ('Sermons,' p. 121). . . . The Lord's Supper had to be explained to the Romanized English folk of that day as being that which [had been travestied in, and] was 'commonly called' the Mass" (*English Churchman*, review of "Some Replies to Mr. Tomlinson's Pamphlet"; see also Gasquet, p. 199, and Tomlinson's "Great Debate," pp. 11, 25).

In Cranmer's book "On the Lord's Supper," published in 1550, he declares his purpose to take clearly away the Mass out of Christian Churches as it is "manifest wickedness and idolatry" (see ch. ix., P.S., p. 349; also ch. xii., pp. 350, 351). Yet of the fifth and last book it has been said that it "is really a defence of the Prayer-Book just set forth, with the praise of which he concludes" (Gasquet's "Edward VI.," p. 199).

It should be noted also that the word "Mass" is used only in the heading of the service: "The Supper of the Lord and the Holy Communion, *commonly called the Mass*." Elsewhere the word is avoided, as in the heading of the Collects, etc.: "The Introits, Collects, Epistles, and Gospels, to be used at the Celebration of the Lord's Supper and Holy Communion through the Year."

This seems to be good evidence that the first book had no intention of setting the seal of approval to the term by which the service had previously been "commonly called." The name "Mass" had been retained in the service of March 8, 1548. So the expression "time of High Mass" had appeared in the Royal Preface to the Homilies in 1547 and 1548. But this was changed to "the Celebration of the Holy Communion" in the edition of 1549 (Brit. Mus., c. 25, g. 12).

deceits" which had grown out of the doctrine of transubstantiation.

In view of this obvious and conspicuous rejection of what had hitherto been so prominent a feature in the Mass, we are bound to pronounce the service in the first book of Edward to have been a very innovating service indeed. And its innovating character is only rendered more marked by the conservative principle which (as compared with the work of Continental Churches of the Reformation) marked the peculiar character of the English Reformation.

The effect of these striking innovations in the book of 1549 has hardly, perhaps, been estimated to the full. The Sarum service had become an eminently sacrificial rite, and elevation was ordered for the purpose of adoration. But in the new book the sacrificial character is made to give place to the prominent feature of communion, and all elevation and ostension is distinctly forbidden. Even among Continental Protestants there were not wanting some who would have hesitated to counsel so sudden and sweeping a measure of reform.¹

Yet—all this notwithstanding—it must be added that the first book took no distinct and decided stand as against more than the Romish doctrine of the mode of the Presence *sub speciebus*.

Therefore there remained yet somewhat that had a doubtful sound in the ears of those who were as the vanguard in the Reformation movement. Of this I shall have occasion to

¹ See "Eucharistic Presence," pp. 501, 502; see also Bucer's "Scripta Anglicana," p. 375, and Gasquet's "Edward VI.," p. 224. Luther did not regard elevation as a dangerous practice. It was prescribed in the Wittenberg order of 1533. And though Luther had given it up in 1539, it is said to have remained in use in Northern Germany (see Gasquet's "Edward VI.," p. 222). See "Eucharistic Worship," p. 28.

speak presently. For the present it must suffice to emphasize the point which I desire specially to have insisted on in answer to the first question, viz., that in the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI., as compared with earlier service books, this is the prominent feature to be noticed—that there is a root-and-branch rejection of the idolatry of transubstantiation, and of all the most salient points of the sacrifice of the Mass.

II. We proceed, then, to our second question, and we ask: What, then, was the doctrinal position of this book in relation to the then existing controversies? It is needless to insist on the fact that it was decidedly anti-Papal. Not, of course, that it was intended to be intolerant of the adherents of the old learning. It was a Liturgy designed for the use of a great national Church—the Church of a nation which, having been recently held in the bonds of superstition, had to be educated in the new learning of a purer faith. But while it was thus intended to be, as far as possible, comprehensive and tolerant, it was unavoidable that its omissions should tell the tale of a decidedly Protestant influence, and so give it a character (as far as omissions and prohibitions could do) which was decidedly anti-Romish.

But it is not sufficient for our purpose to say that its character was anti-Papal. It is essential that our inquiry should go further than this. Protestants at this date were separating into two distinct camps, both decidedly anti-Papal. These were the Lutheran and the Reformed parties. And this separation, which had its accentuation on the Continent, made the echoes of its voices to be pretty clearly heard here in England. It is scarcely necessary to say that the main point of difference was on the question of the Real Presence in the Eucharist. The Lutherans stubbornly insisted on maintaining the doctrine which is commonly called consubstantiation, and which (so far as regards the Presence in the

reception of the Sacrament) can scarcely be said to differ from the Romish doctrine; while the Reformed acknowledged only a Real Presence to the faith of the recipient—a Presence which (though in their view, and in the view even of some eminent mediæval and Romish divines, all that is needful or profitable for the purpose of communion) was consistently and persistently denounced by their opponents as only a Real Absence.

Now, we have to ask: In which of these camps did the new Prayer-Book take its place? To which of these separate parties did it belong?

It has, perhaps, been too commonly assumed to have been Lutheran. It would, as I am persuaded, be far more correct to say that it adhered to neither of these parties. But it would be a still better answer to say that it was the property of both, and did not speak distinctly the language of either.¹

And here we have a position to maintain, which, because it will probably be assailed, we must be content to bestow some labour upon. It will doubtless by many be thought weak, and therefore we must endeavour to defend and fortify it.

It will be my aim, accordingly, to show that those portions of the book which might be most naturally regarded as evidencing a distinctively Lutheran (or decidedly anti-Reformed) character are capable all of being understood in a sense which might be accepted by the Reformed, and, indeed, were held to be defensible by those who rejected most strongly the (so-called) doctrine of consubstantiation.

(1) What some will probably regard as the most difficult statement to reconcile with Reformed doctrine, will be found in a rubric at the end of the Communion Service. This rubric declares: “Men must not think less to be received in part,

¹ See Hills’s letter to Bullinger (June, 1549) in “Original Letters,” P.S. Edit., p. 266, and Bucer’s “Scripta Anglicana,” p. 456; Basil, 1557.

than in the whole, but in each of them the whole body of our Saviour Jesus Christ.”¹ To this Bucer had objected in his “Censura” (p. 459).

This teaching, however, should be classed with other similar declarations in the same book which use the preposition “in” to denote the relation of the *res sacramenti* to the *sacramentum* in the reception of the Lord’s Supper. Thus, in the exhortation to the communicants we have the words, “He hath left *in* those holy mysteries, as a pledge of His love, and a continual remembrance of the same, His own blessed body and precious blood, for us to feed upon spiritually, to our endless comfort and consolation.”

Again, in the prayer after the administration we have the words: “We most heartily thank Thee, for that Thou hast vouchsafed to feed us *in* these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, and hast assured us (duly receiving the same) of Thy favour and goodness towards us.”

But for those who know the place which was taken by Archbishop Cranmer in these liturgical revisions, the following extract will suffice to show that this language was not intended to convey of necessity anything like the distinctive doctrine of the Lutheran Churches: “I say (according to

¹ The practical reason for this rubric is to be found in the fracture necessary on occasions of unexpected numbers of Communicants. Mr. Tomlinson has referred me to Dr. O’Kane’s (of Maynooth) “Notes on the Roman Rubrics” (1867), in which it is recommended (§ 691) that the “parts thus broken be given to the better instructed, for some ignorant persons might suppose that there is an important difference between one of these and a whole particle.”

Bucer did not see in this rubric any necessary teaching of a Presence “sub speciebus,” but only suggested the use of less ambiguous language, “ne ad contentionis rapiantur ab imperitis occasionem, quasi illis affirmetur, Christi corpus in particulis panis quasi localiter inclusum offerri” (Censura in “Scripta Anglicana,” p. 459).

God's Word and the doctrine of the old writers), that Christ is present in His sacraments, as they teach also that He is present in His Word, when He worketh mightily by the same in the hearts of the hearers; by which manner of speech it is not meant that Christ is corporally present in the voice or sound of the speaker (which sound perisheth as soon as the words be spoken), but this speech meaneth that He worketh with His Word, using the voice of the speaker as His instrument to work by, as He useth also His sacraments, whereby He worketh, and therefore is said to be present in them”¹ (“On the Lord’s Supper,” p. 11, P.S. Edit.).

Indeed, language of a far more decidedly Lutheran sound

¹ See also Cranmer’s explanation of the rubric in reply to Gardiner (“On Lord’s Supper,” p. 64, P.S. Edit.), and his apology for the Catechism (of Lutheran origin), authorized by him (in English translation, with important changes; see Burton’s Preface, pp. xiii, xv, xviii) in 1548 (“On Lord’s Supper,” pp. 227, 374, P.S. Edit.).

It will be seen that Gardiner, to whom the book was shown in June, 1550 (see Dasent, “Acts of Privy Council,” iii., pp. 43, 44, 48), though strongly condemning the prohibition of elevation and adoration, claimed four points in the book as having a Catholic sound, and inconsistent with the views of the Reformed.

These points were: (1) The consecration prayer, “wherein we require of God the creatures of bread and wine to be sanctified and to be to us the body and blood of Christ” (Cranmer, “On Lord’s Supper,” P.S. edit., p. 79). To which Cranmer answers, “We do not pray absolutely that the bread and wine may be made the body and blood of Christ, but that unto us in that holy mystery they may be so” (*ibid.*; see also pp. 83, 88). And (2) “that the Church of England teacheth at this day, in the distribution of the Holy Communion, in that it is there said the body and blood of Christ to be under the form of bread and wine” (*ibid.*, p. 51, referring, apparently, to the words of administration). To which Cranmer replies: “When you shall show the place where the form of words is expressed, then shall you purge yourself of that which in the meantime I take to be a plain untruth” (p. 53).

The other two points, (1) “To remember with prayer all estates of the Church, and to recommend them to God” (*ibid.*, p. 84); and (2) the “prayer of humble access” (after consecration), Cranmer passes by as needing no answer (*ibid.*, p. 229).

was on occasion defended and maintained by our Reformers as capable of being fairly understood in the sense of the Reformed. And divines of distinctly anti-Lutheran views did not hesitate to speak of the Body and Blood of Christ, as not only *received in*, but *being*, in a certain sense, *in* the outward and visible signs of them; not, of course, as being contained in them, nor, of course, as being in them viewed simply in themselves, but in them regarded as the ordinance of Christ for the purposes of the Sacrament.

(2) In the prayer of consecration is found language which to some may seem, perhaps, still less in accordance with the doctrine of the Reformed. Here we have the following petition: "Hear us (O merciful Father), we beseech Thee; and with Thy Holy Spirit and Word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son, Jesus Christ," etc.

But the language which speaks of sanctifying the sacramental elements for their sacramental purposes was by no means regarded as inconsistent with the views of those who were called sacramentaries.¹ And there is good reason, as well as high authority, for regarding the addition of the words "to us" as making a very important modification in the meaning of expressions which speak of the elements as being the Body and Blood of Christ.² Thus modified, the words do not at all necessarily imply any change in the ele-

¹ See, e.g., Westminster Confession, ch. xxix. 3.

² So Cranmer explains the meaning of these words as in the first Prayer-Book of Edward, in language which becomes almost the very language substituted for them in the second Prayer-Book ("On Lord's Supper," p. 79, P.S. edit.). Similarly, Herbert Thorndike ("Rel. Assembl.," p. 369; quoted by Waterland, Works, vol. iv., p. 689, note), and Archbishop Laud (see Bulley's "Variations," p. 184), and Waterland (Works, vol. iv., p. 695), and Bishop Field ("Parasceve Paschæ," p. 114, 1624), and Hooker (Works, vol. ii., p. 362, edit. Keble), and Archbishop

ments in themselves. They may quite fairly be understood as signifying no more than their being exhibitive or effectual signs for the conveyance of the *res sacramenti* to the souls of the faithful—in other words, their being to the faithful the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ.

(3) But another difficulty may be found in the words, “We Thy humble servants do celebrate, and make here before Thy Divine majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make.” This is language, indeed, not unnaturally suggestive of a doctrine for which there is, we believe, no foundation in the inspired Word of God. Nevertheless, the words “these Thy holy gifts” do not, any more than “these Thy creatures of bread and wine,” imply of necessity any presence on the Holy Table of the Body and Blood of Christ. It is not questioned that the sacrament was ordained for the continual remembrance of the Sacrifice of the death of Christ. And the memorial of that sacrifice may as well be made by the *ordained signs* of Christ’s crucified Body and outpoured Blood, as by the very Body and Blood of the glorified Redeemer.¹ Such a memorial of a sacrifice in the Lord’s

Wake (Gibson’s “Preservative,” vol. x., p. 56), and Bishop Patrick (“Christian Sacrifice,” pp. 56-59, 1690).

The Bishop of Chichester (Day), who refused to sign the book, or to agree to the “book of their agreement,” gave three reasons for his refusal: (1) The omission of chrism in confirmation; (2) instead of “that it may be unto us,” etc., he would have “be made unto us,” etc.; and (3) after the consecration he would have added, “that these sacrifices and oblations,” etc. (see Gasquet’s “Edward VI.,” p. 164).

¹ In the visitation of the Universities following on the Commission of May, 1549, Ridley arranged for a great public disputation, in which the second conclusion to be maintained was this, “that in the Lord’s Supper there is no other oblation than a giving of thanks and a commemoration of our Lord’s death” (Gasquet’s “Edward VI.,” p. 247). And this in support of the book of 1549. As early, probably, as January, 1548 (see Gasquet, “Edward VI.,” p. 85), Cranmer had come to the conclusion that

Supper may readily be conceded by those who are most faithfully opposed to the blasphemous doctrine of a real sacrificial offering in the Eucharist, and of the Real Objective Presence which underlies it. And the language of this prayer—objectionable as it may be thought to be—ought in fairness to be interpreted by the fact that the language which spoke of the *hostia* in this sacrament had—evidently of set purpose—been eliminated from this service-book.¹

the “oblation and sacrifice” of Christ in the Mass are terms improperly used, and that it is only a “memory and representation” of the sacrifice of the Cross (see Gasquet, p. 86).

Moreover, it appears from the “Administration Book” in the probate registry of Norwich (1549-55) that during the vacancy of the See of Norwich most part of all altars in the diocese had been taken down by the commandment of Cranmer, and this must have been some time in the first twelve months during which the first Prayer-Book was in use (see *Church Intelligencer*, September, 1891, p. 137, and Cranmer’s Works, P.S. “Remains,” p. 154, note).

¹ And by the words, “Christ our Paschal Lamb is offered up for us once for all when He bare our sins in His Body upon the Cross”; as well as by the omission of the sacrificial prayers (see Dr. Stephens in “Sheppard v. Bennett,” p. 215)—the offering of ourselves with our praise and thanksgiving taking the place of Mass-Sacrifice.

M. Gasquet supposes that the word “oblation” was in the first draft of the book, but had disappeared before it came up to the Lords (“Edward VI.,” p. 196). Accordingly he considers the book had been *tampered with* after the Bishops had signed it (p. 179). And this view is endorsed by the review in the *Guardian* of December 17, 1890. This charge rests entirely on the report of the speech of Thirlby, Bishop of Westminster, whose words are set down: “Also there was in the book ‘oblation,’ which is left out now” (p. 405). Gasquet understands this to signify “that when the book was agreed to by the Bishops the word ‘oblation’ was in it, which is now left out.” But that the word was ever in the revised book is extremely unlikely. Not only would it have been altogether out of accord with “Cranmer’s known opinions” as represented by M. Gasquet himself (p. 196), but if such a *tampering* had taken place we should almost certainly have heard more about it; whereas the words of Thirlby are only paralleled with other expressions, which point to a change, not from an earlier draft of the revised book, but from the book of the old use.

Thus interpreted, it may certainly be said that this prayer does not convey—does not even naturally suggest—the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist. It would be easy to fortify our position, if need be, with additional evidence. But, perhaps, what has been alleged may suffice to make good our contention. We are fully satisfied that our second question can only fairly be answered by saying that as regards the doctrinal position of Edward's first book, while it admitted somewhat of a Lutheran sound, a sound which would be agreeable to Lutheran ears, it did not teach distinctly any¹ strictly Lutheran doctrine. Its tendency was very distinctly anti-Papal. It was not at all distinctly anti-Lutheran, but it was also not distinctly anti-Reformed.² It was comprehensive (as far as possible) of the views of

This mistake has been clearly and ably pointed out by the reviewer in the *Church Intelligencer* of January, 1891, p. 12. See also especially p. 159, October, 1891, and Tomlinson's "Great Debate," pp. 21-23.

¹ Thirlby consistently said in the debate of 1548 : " It is a duty to set forth God's truth in plain terms. The want of this plainness in the present case caused him in his conscience not to agree to the doctrine " of the book (see Gasquet, pp. 165, 406). On the other hand, Gardiner, who, desiring to show Cranmer inconsistent, made the most of its ambiguities, could speak of the book as " not distant from the Catholic faith in my judgment " (Cranmer, "On the Lord's Supper," pp. 62 and 92, P.S.; see Gasquet, p. 284).

² Cranmer himself had at this date embraced the doctrine of the Reformed (see "Original Letters," P.S., p. 323).

And Bishop Tunstall, in the House of Lords (December 14, 1548), pointed out that " the adoration was left out of the book " because those who had compiled it believed that " there is nothing in the Sacrament but bread and wine " (see Gasquet's "Edward VI.," p. 161).

There can be little doubt that the book of 1549 was really an *interim* provision with a view to a further reformation (see "Original Letters," P.S., vol. ii., pp. 535, 536, and "Papers on the Eucharistic Presence," No. VII., pp. 514, 515, and Gasquet's "Edward VI.," pp. 95, 234, 235, 259). So the Irish Prayer-Book of 1551 was a reprint of the English book of 1549, which Mr. Walton regards as a "remarkable illustration" of the "doctrinal insincerity" of those in authority ("Rubrical Determination,"

both Lutherans and sacramentaries. There were passages not a few which might doubtless be pleasing to Lutheran hearers, and displeasing, in the sense which they *might* naturally convey, to the ears of those who were strongly opposed to anything like the doctrine of a Corporal Presence.¹

p. 52). This, however, is assuming a doctrinal position for the book of 1549 which we are persuaded is a mistaken one.

There was much need for caution, and great dread (with great cause) of the consequences of "sudden mutation." See Latimer's "Sermon of the Plough" ("Sermons," P.S., p. 76) and Gasquet's "Edward VI.," pp. 251 *et seq.* Bucer, in 1551, wrote to the King: "Your sacred Majesty has already found by experience how grave are the evils which ensued on taking away by force false worship from your people without sufficient preliminary instruction" ("De Regno Christi," lib. ii., cap. v.). See Gasquet, p. 300.

¹ It is true that the Lutheran doctrine of the Presence can consistently claim, if true, to be regarded as an article of the faith. And therefore the first Prayer-Book, in admitting Lutheranism, was admitting that which might make a claim, if admitted at all, to be admitted alone. But it does not follow that the first book, in admitting a sound of Lutheran doctrine, was admitting this claim, however consistent. It might say—and we believe that in effect it did say—to the doctrine of a Corporal Presence, "Room is not altogether denied to you here; only you must be content to take the place of a tolerated opinion beside another tolerated (and more favoured) opinion which is your contradictory." No doubt this was like offering to it a place as to live in, in which its life must be enfeebled as unto death. But the Reformers would doubtless have preferred that, without doing violence to it too violently, it might die a natural death. There was policy, therefore, in the *mixed* character of the first book, regarded as an *interim* measure. But it must be obvious that such a book had not the elements of endurance, regarded as a permanent provision for the worship of the English Church. It must have been evident that it could never give satisfaction to any party. And, as a matter of fact, we know what dissatisfaction it gave both to the Reformed and to the anti-Reformed.

Thus Hooper speaks of the book as "very defective and of *doubtful* construction, and in some respects, indeed, manifestly impious" ("Original Letters," P.S., p. 79). And Dryander writes of it: "You will find something to blame in the matter of the Lord's Supper, for the book speaks very obscurely, and however you may try to explain it with candour, you cannot avoid great absurdity. The reason is, the Bishops could not for

But there was in it absolutely nothing that need either have shocked the views of the Lutheran or (as regards any

a long time agree among themselves respecting this article" (*ibid.*, pp. 350, 351. See Gasquet, "Edward VI.," pp. 232, 233).

Early in 1548 John ab Ulmis wrote to Bullinger: "Peter Martyr has maintained the cause of the Eucharist and Holy Supper of the Lord; namely, that it is a remembrance of Christ and a solemn setting forth of His death, and not a sacrifice. Meanwhile, however, he speaks with caution and prudence—if, indeed, it can be called such—with respect to the Real Presence, so as not to seem to incline either to your opinion or to that of Luther" ("Original Letters," P.S., pp. 377, 378. See Gasquet, p. 103). These words may be said, we believe, exactly to express the doctrinal position which the first book was intended to occupy.

That the first Prayer-Book was not intended to teach any distinctly Lutheran doctrine is certain from Cranmer's vindication of the language which made the nearest approach to Lutheran sound in his work on the Lord's Supper, which was written from a distinctly Reformed standpoint. And that Cranmer was already standing on the same doctrinal standpoint before the authorization of the first Prayer-Book is now abundantly evident from the "Notes touching the Disputation of the Bishops," which has been published by Gasquet. See especially Gasquet's "Edward VI.," pp. 434, 440, 441.

And though he had been "in the error of the Real Presence" not long before (see "On the Lord's Supper," P.S., p. 374), it may be inferred that his views had changed before the publication of his translated German Catechism, from the evident design of his changes to de-Lutheranize its teaching (see Gasquet, "Edward VI.," pp. 130, 131).

Richard Hills, a man very well informed in such matters, wrote from London on June 1, 1549: "We have an uniform celebration of the Eucharist throughout the whole kingdom, but after the manner of the Nuremberg Churches and some of those in Saxony" ("Original Letters," P.S., p. 266). Evidence of the influence of the Lutheran pattern on the book of 1549 will be found in Gasquet's "Edward VI.," ch. xiii.; see especially pp. 228, 229. But abundant evidence that the book was not intended to teach distinctly Lutheran doctrine will be found also in pp. 229-235. It is clear that at this date Cranmer had adopted the views of the Reformed. And Gasquet quite rightly speaks (p. 233) of "the care taken to employ turns of expression which should not clash with his new views."

Latimer found "no great diversity" in the Communion offices of the first and second Books of Common Prayer ("Remains," P.S., p. 262),

doctrine distinctly taught) have been a necessary cause of offence to the Reformed.

And the importance of this will be seen, I believe, when we proceed in the next chapter to examine the second book of Edward VI.

which is explained by the fact that he regarded their transubstantiation, and oblation, and adoration as "the very sinews and marrow-bones of the Mass" (Ridley's Works, P.S., p. 112), and these were not found in the first book (see Gasquet, "Edward VI.," p. 276). But it should be noted that Latimer added, "I do not well remember wherein they [the two books] differ" ("Remains," p. 262).

"This," it has been said, "was the state of our first English Liturgy, in which our Reformers had, with great discretion, chosen rather to retain some things, which might otherwise have been lawfully omitted, than, by going too far at first, to stagger men of weak and prejudiced minds, whom moderate compliances might bring to temper and reconcile to the Reformation" (Downes, "Appendix to Lives of Compilers of the Liturgy," p. clxv. London, 1722).

CHAPTER II.

THE SECOND BOOK OF EDWARD VI.

IN the former chapter I endeavoured to show that the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI., while distinctly rejecting what belonged to the doctrine of Rome, gave an uncertain sound as regards the doctrine of the Corporal Presence, using language which might seem to be conciliatory towards the Lutherans, but which did not necessarily involve the teaching of the doctrine of Luther.

In the present chapter we have to deal with the second Prayer-Book of Edward. We have again two questions to ask; and in answering these, it is important for us to bear clearly in mind what we have learnt in answer to our questions concerning the first book.

1. Our first question is: In what relation did Edward's second book stand to the first?

There appears to have been much misunderstanding on this point.

Yet about the answer to this question, when fairly examined, I can hardly suppose that there is, or will be—I am quite sure there ought not to be—any doubt or hesitation whatever.

But the answer is so important for the purpose we have now in view, that I must be allowed to emphasize the fact that it was just Edward's first book, divested of whatever had sounded a doubtful note—a note which might have grated

on the ears of the Reformed, and seemed to any to harmonize with, or be suggestive of, the doctrine of Luther. If it is evident that there was in the first book a steadfast purpose to take quite out of the way whatever could tend in any degree to support the doctrines of Transubstantiation, it is not less evident that the revision which gave us the second book was carefully carried out with a fixed design to let nothing remain that could lend encouragement to the doctrine of a Corporal Presence. If the first book was distinctly anti-Papal, the second book was distinctly and unmistakably anti-Lutheran.¹

¹ It may be said to have a mediæval (or, rather, *ancient*) basis, with the mediæval superstructure carefully removed, then built upon with a Lutheran framework, from which the interior of Lutheran doctrine has been forcibly and laboriously discarded.

Thus the very remains of what had been received by tradition from the Middle Ages testify to the deliberate rejection of Popery. And the very Lutheran form of the formulary bears clear witness to the evident *design* of altogether eliminating the Lutheran doctrine.

The claim made for the Mozarabic Liturgy as influencing our Reformed Formularies must await the result of further research. There are difficulties in the way of supposing that Cranmer had access to a copy of this rite. But so long as it is admitted that the form of blessing the font (in the Baptismal Service of 1549) "must have been obtained either directly or indirectly from the Spanish Liturgy" (Gasquet, "Edward VI.," p. 185; see also Mr. Burbidge's Letter in the *Guardian* of February 6, 1895), it cannot be regarded as impossible that the Communion Service also may have been similarly affected. And there are not lacking indications that it was so affected (see Burbidge's "Liturgies and Offices," pp. 175, 177, 230; and "Papers on the Eucharistic Presence," p. 511).

It should be noted, however, that with very slight and unimportant variations, the recital of the "words of institution" (which exhibits so striking a similarity to the Mozarabic Liturgy: see Mr. Warren's Letter in the *Guardian*, March 22, 1890) is found to correspond with the formula of the Nuremberg order of 1533, as well as with that given in the Latin version by Justus Jonas of the Catechism of Nuremberg (see Droop's "Edwardian Vestments," p. 44), and with Cranmer's translation of this (see Gasquet's "Edward VI.," pp. 446-448).

Where was the declaration about receiving in each part the whole Body of our Saviour Jesus Christ? It was gone. Where now was the petition for sanctifying the gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of the Saviour?¹ They were nowhere. Where was the statement, "He hath left in these holy mysteries . . . His own Blessed Body and precious Blood"?

And it seems not altogether improbable that this formula may have had its origin in an attempt to make "a harmony of all the four narratives of the institution contained in the New Testament" (Gasquet, p. 446); and we know that Cranmer had long before been studying the Nuremberg form (see Brewer's "State Papers," vol. v., p. 410; see also Gasquet's "Edward VI.," p. 207). Still, there seems no great force in the argument that Luther cannot have derived it from the Mozarabic, because that rite, "in its continual expression of the idea of sacrifice" (Gasquet, p. 445), would have been distasteful to him.

As regards the Greek Liturgies, it is not doubtful that they were in part known to our English Reformers (see Dowden's "Annotated Scottish Com. Off.," pp. 11, 12), but by some they seem to have been doubtfully regarded (see Gasquet, "Edward VI.," pp. 168, 186, 187). They can hardly be said to have made any very decided or very marked impression on our English Communion Service. Their influence cannot be spoken of with any certainty. Yet certain features seem to indicate some probable derivation (see Burbidge, p. 194, and Scudamore's "Not. Euch.," p. 512, 2nd Edit.).

I much regret that in an article in the "Churchman" of February, 1892, I was misled by an error of Palmer in stating that the Liturgy of St. James had been printed at Rome in 1526. I am indebted to Mr. Tomlinson for kindly pointing out this mistake (see Swainson's "Greek Liturgies," Introduction, p. ix). It was published (with others) in Latin at Antwerp, 1560; and in 1562 it was quoted in the Council of Trent (see Theiner, ii., pp. 69, 91; see also Jewel's Works, "Sermon and Harding," p. 114, P.S.).

¹ See the reason for the change as given by Bishop Guest (Dugdale's "Life," pp. 147, 148), Cosin (Nicholl's "Additional Notes," pp. 45, 53; and Works, A.C.L., vol. v., pp. 470, 471). The effect of the change was pointed out by Bishop Scott, of Chester, in his speech before Parliament, 1559 (see Cardwell's "Conferences," p. 113). The change had been urged by Bucer (see "Scripta Anglicana," p. 468).

It had been struck out.¹ Where were the words of thanking God "for that Thou hast vouchsafed to feed us *in* these holy mysteries with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ"? They have been changed into the words, "for that Thou hast vouchsafed to feed us who have duly received these holy mysteries."²

¹ In 1549, in the exhortation, when "the people be negligent," we have these words: "Wherefore our duty is to come to these holy mysteries with most hearty thanks to be given to Almighty God for His infinite mercy and benefits given and bestowed upon us His unworthy servants, for whom He hath not only given His Body to death and shed His Blood, but also doth vouchsafe, in a Sacrament and mystery, to give us His said Body and Blood to feed upon spiritually" (Cardwell, p. 276).

In the exhortation to be said "some time" in the book of 1552, we have a corresponding statement, but with a sentence altered (and very awkwardly expressed in the alteration), obviously for the purpose of avoiding anything like a Lutheran sound, thus: ". . . most hearty thanks, for that He hath given His Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance, as it is declared unto us, as well by God's Word as by the Holy Sacraments of His blessed Body and Blood" (Cardwell, p. 286).

The change made in this at the last review not only removed the awkwardness of the expression, it was also *doctrinally* preferable (see "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," pp. 433, 484-488). The carefulness to shun anything like the Corporal Presence had given to the awkward expression something too much like a (so-called) Zwinglian sound. It might have seemed to some to look like an ignoring of the true *Unio Sacramentalis*, as taught by "Reformed" divines (see "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 182-184).

² This post-Communion thanksgiving is a Lutheran form with the words of Lutheran sound thus extracted. It is taken from the Brandenburg-Nürnberg Order (see Jacob's "Lutheran Movement in England," p. 243). So also the words of distribution in the first book, "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee," "shed for thee" (which were unknown to the Mass), were adopted from the Nürnberg formula (*ibid.*, p. 242); and their omission in the second book was doubtless owing to some (needless) suspicion that they might be capable of suggesting the idea of the Lutheran doctrine of the Presence. The words substituted in 1552 were strongly anti-Lutheran in sound—sufficiently so

Labour and learning and ingenuity indeed have been expended, and taxed to the utmost, in the endeavour to find yet some dens and caves in which the doctrine of a Corporal—*i.e.*, a local (called “supra-local”)—Presence may still find a lurking-place. But surely the very shifts to which they have been driven in these attempts afford an evidence of the carefulness and thoroughness with which our Reformers eliminated everything that had a sound or a semblance of anything beyond the doctrine of the Reformed.¹

to correct any misapprehension from the use of the earlier form, when the two forms were combined in the book of Elizabeth. It seems to have most resembled the form of John a Lasco (see Cardwell, “Two Liturgies,” Preface, pp. xxx, xxxi).

Dean Aldrich declares, “ ‘Tis manifest that neither form single, nor both of ‘em together, either owns a *Corporal* or denies a *Real Presence*” (“Reply to Two Discourses,” p. 7, Oxford, 1687).

¹ The idea that the revising hand was a foreign hand, and the revision an un-English work, must be altogether abandoned. It is nothing but a prevalent misconception that we have to think of the changes as owing to the guidance and direction of Continental Reformers. Peter Martyr’s letter to Bucer (of January 10, 1550-1551; see Gorham’s “Reformation Gleanings,” p. 229) makes it evident, not only that he had not been consulted, but that he had not even been well informed as to the “many alterations” which had been concluded on (see Collier’s “Ecclesiastical History,” vol. v., p. 434). He did not even presume to ask Cranmer for information as to “what these corrections were” (see Burbidge’s “Liturgeries and Offices,” p. 166). But it by no means follows that the English action in the matter had received no impulse from the influence of Reformers from abroad (see Lorimer’s “John Knox,” p. 49). In the same letter Peter Martyr “gives God thanks for making himself and Bucer instrumental in putting the Bishops in mind of the exceptionable places in the Common Prayer.” It must not, however, be supposed that Bucer’s “Censura” was taken as a guide to be followed in the revision (see Cardwell’s “Two Liturgies,” Preface, pp. xxvii, xxviii).

There is good reason to believe that our English Reformers, in preparing the second book, were entering heartily into a *perfecting* work, which was in view in their original design (see “Papers on the Eucharistic Presence,” pp. 513-516, 497-501).

It has been said by a learned writer: “What we are concerned to show

Some may perhaps think that this carefulness was excessive, and allowed to run to extremes. But its aim, its

is that there was no sudden and abrupt change after the publication of the first Prayer-Book, as if different parties and different interests had been concerned in the drawing-up of the two Prayer-Books, but that there was a scheme deliberately planned from the first, the idea being to get rid at all hazards of the service and doctrine of the Mass, and the sacrifice, by representing the matter as one of reform, and not of abolition" (*Church Quarterly Review*, October, 1892, p. 58).

"It [the book of 1549] was designed as a half-way house towards a second Prayer-Book, which should be more unequivocally Protestant in tone. And that this was so is abundantly evidenced in the correspondence of the day" (*ibid.*, October, 1893, p. 137).

If the leading foreigners "affected for a time the whole character of Liturgical worship in England" (Luckock, "Studies," p. 65), it was only because our English Reformers were at one with them in their "Reformed" views, and were willing from any quarter to accept suggestions which might commend themselves to their judgments (see Cardwell's "Two Liturgies," Preface, pp. xxviii-xxx).

As regards the very improbable report "carried about in Frankford" that "Cranmer had drawn up a book of prayers a hundred times more perfect," Jenkyns observes that Strype "is fully justified in treating it as altogether unworthy of credit" ("Cranmer's Works," Preface, p. liv). Dr. Cardwell, indeed, considers the report "an exaggerated statement rather than as entirely groundless" ("Two Liturgies," Preface, p. xxxv); and he thinks "we may infer that he [Cranmer] was not satisfied with it [the book of 1552] in all respects from the order of Council, which was issued soon afterwards in explanation of the kneeling at the Communion" (p. xxxvi). But, then, Dr. Cardwell had not seen the letter of Cranmer which Mr. Perry has printed from the STATE PAPER OFFICE in his "Declaration on Kneeling" (pp. 77, 78), which shows clearly, not only how little disposed Cranmer was to sympathize with the objections to kneeling reception, but also how little inclination he had to yield to the pressure for further innovation from "these glorious and unquiet spirits, which can like nothing but that is after their own fancy; and cease not to make trouble and disquietness when things be most quiet and in good order." He adds: "If such men should be heard, although the book were made every year anew, yet should it not lack faults in their opinion" (see Lorimer's "John Knox," pp. 103-105, 107, 110-121, 275-289).

The great value of this letter consists in this—that it shows that Cranmer (while he had willingly set to "his hand and his axe" with the

purpose, its design, is too manifest to admit of any fair question for those who will honestly look at the facts. And this carefulness did not stop at the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation. It did not confine itself to the matter of the Eucharistic Presence. We are familiar in our day with the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice,¹ and with that doctrine as made dependent on the doctrine of the so-called Real Objective Presence. The claim is made on behalf of a Christian *sacerdotium*, that its function is in this Sacrament to offer sacrificially a sacrificial and propitiatory memorial before God (with the really present Body and Blood of Christ on the altar) of the one sacrifice on the Cross. And this claim is too often made to rest on forced interpretations of our Blessed Lord's words in the institution of the Lord's Supper. This claim, indeed, has been abundantly disproved. It is actually void of any scriptural warrant; and we may be well assured our English reformers, with Cranmer at their head, would never have allowed it. They were dead against

rest at the perfecting of the Prayer-Book by giving it a distinctly "Reformed" character) was sensible of the danger to the Reformation from the violent tendencies of extremists, and was resolved, as far as in him lay, to protect the Church of England from the floods which might result from the rising tide of Puritan excesses. And this, we believe, was not the first time that Cranmer had given expression to similar sentiments. We may doubtless trace the same hand in the notice "Of Ceremonies," which appeared in the end of the Book of 1549, and which followed the "Preface" in 1552. There we read "Some be so new-fangled, that they would innovate all things, and so do despise the old that nothing can like them but that is new."

¹ In this connection it should be observed that, whereas in the first book there had been a prayer "for the whole state of Christ's Church," which ended with a recommending the dead to the mercy of God. This recommendation was omitted in the second book, and the words "militant here on earth" were added in the prefix, "to show that the Church not only did not practise intercession for the dead, but even carefully excluded it" (Cardwell, "Two Liturgies," Preface, p. xxxiv).

any such teaching of the Eucharistic sacrifice. They saw in it the roots of all the vain superstitions and blasphemous delusions of the Mass.¹

But if the words of Edward's first book,² which spoke of "making here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make," had been allowed to remain, they might have afforded something like a colourable pretext as a shelter for a doctrine making something like an approach to such a perversion of the truth.³

¹ In this matter Luther and the Lutherans would also have agreed with them (see, *e.g.*, "Historia Comitiorum, MDXXX., Augustæ Celebratorum," Frankfort-on-Oder, 1597, folios 53, 54).

² It has been said "Cranmer substituted a new prayer of about the same length as the old Canon, leaving in it a few shreds of the ancient one, but divesting it of its character of sacrifice and oblation. Even the closest theological scrutiny of the new composition will not detect anything inconsistent with or excluding Luther's negation of the sacrificial idea of the Mass" (Gasquet's "Edward VI.," pp. 223, 224). This is true; and the words quoted in the text, as interpreted by the animus which governed the revision, would convey no idea of the *Mass-sacrifice*. But, as regarded by themselves, they must be allowed to be also not incapable of conveying a sense not inconsistent with a sacrificial idea. Indeed, they are appealed to by Dean Luckock ("Studies," p. 45) as evidence to show that the Revisionists of 1549 "were extremely careful to avoid bringing the sacrificial view into discredit."

³ The words of Institution constitute the Lord's Supper an ἀνάμνησις—*i.e.*, simply "a perpetual memory" to be *continued*—not a μνημόσυνον θυσίας—*i.e.* (in the technical terminology of the LXX.), a sacrificial memorial to be *offered* by a *ἱερεύς* on the altar to the Lord (see "The Eucharist considered in its Sacrificial Aspect," Elliot Stock, pp. 23, 24).

But though *μνημόσυνον* is translated "memorial," it should not be understood as necessarily a remembrance of a *past* event. The azkârâh was a present calling to mind of the worshipper before God. See Abbott's "Essays," pp. 123-127.

The language of the second book admits only the idea of ἀνάμνησις. The rejected language of the first book was certainly capable (as we think) of suggesting the idea of *μνημόσυνον*.

If this is so, the doctrinal significance of the change is not to be

It is true, indeed, that the sting of such teaching may be said to have been taken away in the taking away of the doctrine of the Corporal Presence. Nevertheless, the vigilance of the revision could not suffer such language to remain. And in the second book not only is this language rejected, but with it is rejected whatever could be regarded as being accessory to such a system of teaching. Everything that could possibly be accounted as a clothing of this doctrine, or a suitable accompaniment to it, is carefully removed. The name of Mass is gone ; the altar is turned into a table ;¹

depreciated, especially when viewed in connection with what is sometimes called the *dislocation* of the Prayer of Oblation, the design of which was evidently to separate its sacrificial language from any possible connection with the consecrated elements (see "Papers on the Eucharistic Presence," No. VII., pp. 454, 555).

The *μνημόσυνον* may be said to ask for (if not to demand) some sort of Real Objective Presence. For the *ἀνάμνησις* any such Presence is superfluous. The *μνημόσυνον* is co-related to a *θυσιαστήριον*. The *ἀνάμνησις* needs only a *τράπεζα Κυρίου* (1 Cor. x. 21).

The word *ἀνάμνησις*, when standing alone, never (we believe) makes approaches to the signification of *μνημόσυνον* (see "The Eucharist considered in its Sacrificial Aspect," Note I., p. 23; and "Some Recent Teachings concerning the Eucharistic Sacrifice," pp. 10, 15, 16).

¹ An order of Council had been issued for changing altars into tables in 1550. This order was perhaps in conformity with law; but some earlier episcopal orders had gone before the law. While the name "altar" remained, it was explained as referring to the "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" (see Edward's letter to Ridley in Bulley's "Variations," p. 147). One of the "reasons" given by the order in Council for the change is this, that "the form of a table shall more move the simple from the superstitious opinions of the Popish Mass unto the right use of the Lord's Supper. For the use of an altar is to make sacrifice upon it ; the use of a table is for men to eat upon" (Foxe, "Acts and Monuments," vol. vi., p. 6, edit. Townsend, 1838).

The second "reason" justifies the change on the ground that the Book of Common Prayer calleth the thing "indifferently a table, an altar, or the Lord's board, without prescription of any form thereof."

It has not, perhaps, been generally noted how the first Prayer-Book

the sacerdotal vestments¹ are not to be seen; and, further, the eastward position² is to be used no more.³

had prepared the way for the removal of altars. For while it retained in five places the word "altar," it introduced (besides the term "God's board") twice the name "Lord's table" ("for the first time," says Mr. Walton, p. 52, "in the rubrics of any Catholic Liturgy"), probably from Hermann's "Consultatio," in which it is also found side by side with the occasional term "altar." It had been used also in the "Order of Service of the Church of Denmark." "No one," says Mr. Walton, "acquainted with these two foreign manuals can have any doubt as to the thoroughly Protestant and non-sacrificial intention of their language. It is important, then," he adds, "to trace this term 'Lord's table' to its true source, because generous attempts have been made to assign it a strictly Catholic sense; but its immediate derivation from foreign Protestants, together with Bucer's use of 'Mensa Domini,' when speaking of the 'altar' of the English Liturgy of 1549 ('Censura,' p. 459, etc.), seems quite conclusive against this higher view" ("Rubrical Determination," p. 52, enlarged edition).

Attempts are sometimes made to represent the omission of the word "altar" from the Prayer-Book of 1552 as having no doctrinal significance, or as indicative only of a desire to restore the "Communion" aspect to the service without excluding the Mass-sacrifice. But the other corresponding changes, if we knew nothing of the history of the revision, would suffice to refute every such plea. The change did not, of course, imply that the word "altar" could not be used (as by the ancients) in a sense which might be innocent. But it did imply that there was danger of its being understood in a sense suggestive of false doctrine, and that the revision which was to make the book "fully perfect" should use all caution to shun the danger.

And when Laudian divines defended the use of the word, it was at a time when the danger might by some be regarded as past. So the canons of 1640 assume that, as applied to the holy table, it cannot be understood in a "proper" sense, and that the "Corporal Presence" (now regarded by some as essential to the Eucharistic sacrifice of the altar) can have no place in the Liturgy of the English Church.

Mr. Warren assures us (*Guardian* of March 4, 1891) that in Western Liturgies *altare* is the rule; *mensa* is the exception. In Eastern (Greek) Liturgies *τράπεζα* is the rule, *θυσιαστήριον* the exception.

¹ It should be observed that the first book of Edward left the use of the vestment (or chasuble, the essentially sacrificial vesture) optional. "It may be taken as certain," says Gasquet, "that those attached to the

² Note on next page.

³ Note on page 29.

ancient custom would vest as before, whilst those who desired change would adopt the cope, which broke with past ecclesiastical tradition and the universal practice, and enable them to display their rejection of the sacrificial character of the service" (p. 190). Cranmer himself officiated "in a cope, and no vestment, nor mitre, nor cross, but a cross staff was borne afore him" ("Grey Friars' Ch.," p. 60; quoted from Gasquet, p. 241).

It is evident that the service drawn up in 1533 for Brandenburg and Nuremberg had its influence on the book of 1549. And in that order it is directed that "the priest is not to wear a chasuble, but a cope only; or in village churches, where there are no copes, a mere surplice, lest simple folk should imagine it was intended to celebrate Mass after the former fashion without communicants" (see *Church Intelligencer*, January, 1891, p. 12).

But, then, it must be observed that the book of 1549 differed from the German in that it at least allowed the chasuble.

It may probably be that the sacerdotal character of the chasuble was not always ascribed to it (see *Church Quarterly Review*, January, 1891, pp. 460, 461). But it will hardly be questioned that (at the date of the Reformation) the distinction between the chasuble and the cope was pretty generally recognised (see Scudamore's "Notitia Euch.," pp. 66-75, 99, 100, second edition; see also Marriott's "Vestiarium Christianum," pp. 224, 225).

² The rubric at the commencement of the first book ordered the priest to stand "humbly afore in the midst of the altar," which in the second book is changed to "the north side of the table." This is what we mean by the rejection of the eastward position, not any rubrical direction concerned only with the prayer of consecration.

Archbishop Laud's Prayer-Book for Scotland (1637) allowed the presbyter *for that prayer* to stand so as he could most conveniently use both his hands. And Bishop Wren's own reason for standing on occasion *for that prayer only* with his back to the people was that, being little of stature, he could not otherwise well reach over the book for the manual acts.

None, it may be presumed, would ever think of objecting to the occasional convenience of such a posture *in this part* of the service if all doctrinal significance were removed by the ministers really turning to perform the manual acts visibly before the people.

It may, however, be observed that none of the eleven reasons given by Durandus for the eastward position cover the significance attached to that position by those who value it as teaching the Eucharistic sacrifice (see "Rationale," lib. v., cap. ii., § 57, p. 340; Neapoli, 1859).

2. Now, whatever we may think of this very bold and decided, not to say *slashing*, work from the Liturgiologist's point of view, it ought certainly to be admitted that it makes the answer to our second question very easy.

"What was the doctrinal position of Edward's second book?"

Can any doubt that it was not only distinctly, but strongly, anti-Lutheran? Is it possible to question that it set forth the Eucharistic doctrine of the Church of England as strictly and straitly adhering to that of the so-called Sacramentaries?¹

Some years since an English clergyman was met in the streets of Berlin by a learned Lutheran Professor, who

³ These changes should be viewed in connection with corresponding changes in the ordinal (see "Papers on the Eucharistic Presence," No. VII., p. 533, *sq.*).

What was strictly Roman in the ordinal had been eliminated before. Now there is no longer the delivery of the chalice or cup with the bread.

It should also be observed that in the second book there is no place for what in the first was "The very qualified permission of reservation for a few hours" for sick communion.

¹ M. Gasquet truly says: "It is . . . not a little significant that everything in the first Prayer-Book upon which Gardiner had fixed as evidence that the new Liturgy did not reject the old belief was in the revision carefully swept away and altered" ("Edward VI.," p. 289). And of other changes he truly says: "The only reason which it seems possible to give is that the innovators resolved that it should henceforth be impossible to trace in the new Communion office any resemblance, however innocuous, to the ancient Mass" (p. 291). In spite of Bucer's most earnest desire that the words, "Whosoever shall be partakers of the Holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious body and blood of Thy Son Jesus Christ," might be retained, even at the risk of their being interpreted of a Corporal Presence, they were left out, though "the parallel passage in the prayer of humble access, now removed to a part of the service before the canon, was allowed to remain" (p. 293).

accosted him, saying, "Mr. Ayerst, I have been studying your English Communion Service. Why, *you are Reformed!*"

In England (unhappily, perhaps) the study of the difference between the confessions of the "Reformed" and the Lutherans is almost out of date. In Germany it is well understood still, and the Professor's language intimated very clearly that he found no trace of Lutheran doctrine in our English Liturgy.

It need not be supposed for a moment that we are claiming for the Church of England to be the champion of opinions now commonly stigmatized (though probably in error) by the name of Zwinglian.¹ There were doubtless some Reformed divines on the Continent who, by the dread of Lutheran doctrine, were driven sometimes towards an opposite extreme. But in England it would seem that (notwithstanding some exceptions) neither did the Lutheran doctrine, nor what may be called the doctrine of bare *significance*, ever obtain any very influential or conspicuous following.

There were never wanting among the Reforming divines abroad those who were vehemently opposed to any teaching which might seem to have a suspicious sound as tending to reduce the sacraments of the Gospel to anything like empty signs. And at home the voices of our English divines,

¹ They should rather be called Schwenkfeldian. But it should be remembered that Zwingle's tendencies and some of his earlier utterances gave occasion for that which "some did exceedingly fear" (Hooker, "Ecc. Pol.", V., ch. lxvii., § 12). After the "consensus Tigurinus" (1549), the Swiss doctrine was less open to misrepresentation, and should have been better understood. There was then "a general agreement concerning that which alone is material" (Hooker, "Ecc. Pol.", V., ch. lxvii., § 12). It bridged the chasm which had separated the two sections of the Reformed, though some still stood aloof. Our English Reformers generally were very strong in repudiating any sympathy with the views which would have reduced the Sacraments to empty signs (see "Papers on the Eucharistic Presence," No. V., pp. 269-279).

strongly and distinctly anti-Lutheran, were lifted up almost as the voice of one man in strong and distinct renunciation and repudiation of any such tendency to degrade the holy ordinances of Christ.

But the point we wish to insist upon very strongly is this, that not only is the “reformed” character of Edward’s second book prominent on the face of it; its true doctrinal position is singularly confirmed and established by the very history of its revision. If the record of the changes made in our Liturgy in the reign of Edward VI. had been the account of one revision only, we should have missed an argument the force of which is now not to be evaded. If all the changes effected in that reign had been made at once—made with one sweep—we should not have been able to distinguish, as we can clearly do now, two distinct steps, with two separate designs (the result of caution¹), in the matter of our revision. It might then have been just possible, perhaps, that all the changes might have been set down to an excessive caution in eliminating everything that could favour the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation.

As it is, we see that *end* evidently aimed at and accomplished in the first revision. We have another and a further end evidently aimed at and accomplished in the second revision. That further aim was, beyond question, the fully perfecting our Prayer-Book by casting out everything that by a doubtful sound could seem to find harbour for the Eucharistic doctrine of Luther.² The first revision was the result of a

¹ The order for the use of the first Prayer-Book had been followed by risings in Devonshire, Cornwall, Berks, Oxfordshire, and other counties. But it would be a mistake to suppose that *all* these were due to zeal for the old religion. See Dixon’s “Hist. of Ch. of Eng.,” vol. iii., pp. 43, 44, 55, 60.

² See the opinion of Cornelius Schulting of Cologne, as quoted in Gasquet’s “Edward VI.,” p. 306.

fixed purpose, whose word of command was, "Let nothing remain that savours of the transubstantiation of Rome." The second revision was as the perfect obedience to a steadfast determination, whose orders were, "Let everything be utterly cast away that can seem to favour the doctrine of a Real Corporal Presence in or under the elements."

Now, if this be so, it is a fact which ought to be made prominent. We must be permitted to say that the mists which have been of late years allowed to becloud it ought to be cleared away. The Reformed Church of England has a right to expect of us that we should vindicate her "Reformed" doctrine, and make her true doctrinal position perfectly unambiguous—as unambiguous as it was when Archbishop Whitgift¹ declared before the world that this Church of England had, thank God! been reformed to the quick, and had "refused the doctrine of the Real Presence."²

Every Church's Eucharistic Service ought to teach the Eucharistic doctrine to the full, and the Church of England declares in her canons³ that her Communion Service does teach it to the full. And yet that Service knows absolutely nothing, and the history of that Service makes it abundantly manifest that it has designedly determined to know nothing,

¹ "Mr. Martyr nameth the Popish things which the Lutherans observe to be the *Real Presence*—images, all the Popish apparel which they used in their Mass (for so doth he mean), which *this Church has refused*. What his opinion is of this apparel that we retain I have declared, Tract VII., chap. v., Division 4, where he of purpose speaketh concerning the same. God be thanked! religion is wholly reformed, even to the quick, in this Church" (Whitgift's Works, P.S. Edit., vol. iii., p. 550).

This was published when Whitgift was Master of Trinity College. Whitgift became Archbishop of Canterbury in 1583 (see "Papers on the Eucharistic Presence," pp. 34, 37-39).

² That is, of course, in the Romish sense. In another sense "the Real Presence" was maintained even by Puritan divines.

³ See "Papers on the Eucharistic Presence," No. VII., pp. 462, 463.

has of set purpose refused to know or teach anything of any Real Presence locally under the form of the consecrated elements.

In view of the language of our Liturgy, and in view of what we know from history to have been rejected from our Communion Service, it is now impossible to doubt to which of the two great divisions, "Lutheran" and "Reformed," we belong. In externals, indeed, the Church of England has conformed to neither. And in her independent action she has declined the controlling guidance of both, and she has withheld the dictation of those who, in misdirected zeal for the truth, were sowing discord among brethren. (See Dixon's "Hist. of Ch. of Eng.," vol. ii., pp. 524-527.)

But not the less is her doctrinal standpoint unmistakable. And even for those resolved to mistake it the history of our Prayer-Book gives evidence which should be decisive. The German Professor said right, "*You are Reformed.*"

I am quite sensible, indeed, that in such matters it is possible, and unhappily rather common, to make a good deal too much of historical arguments. Our responsibility in respect of our symbolical and liturgical standards is to be measured by the plain, natural, and honest interpretation of language, not by recondite historical researches.

The arguments of much plausible special pleading as against the obvious sense of our formularies might be easily dispersed by the force of Lord Selborne's statement: "The propositions embodied in that law [e.g., an Act of Parliament] may have recommended themselves for different reasons to different minds. What was proposed, but not adopted, may have been either disapproved on its merits or simply deemed superfluous. Even, therefore, if the proof of the intention of the mover of a particular proposition were direct and demonstrative, it is *immaterial*, unless it appears *on the face of the*

law. Its irrelevancy is still more manifest when . . . the proof is conjectural and imperfect" ("Notes on Liturgical History," pp. 4, 5).

Nevertheless, patent facts of history may very well be summoned as witnesses in support of the natural meaning of our formularies. And the value of their testimony may sometimes be rated high for the defence of those formularies against misunderstanding and misrepresentation.

It is what may be called its indefinite character which has made it possible for the first book to be so differently regarded from different points of view. Thus (1) there are some who would speak of it as Popish, even as Bishop Gardiner (who had a purpose to serve) claimed for some of its details a "Catholic" character. These have failed to take account of the conspicuous absence of all that could give support to the Mass-sacrifice. All "oblation" is absent, and absent because "left out." There are (2) others who regard it as Lutheran, even as strong anti-Lutherans condemned it in its own day. These have not sufficiently noticed the ambiguities of the language which seemed to have the strongest Lutheran sound. It was capable, as Cranmer showed, of a sound sense. (3) Others have pronounced it to be Reformed, even as Latimer regarded its doctrine as not much differing from that of the second book. These have scarcely given sufficient attention to the shelter or tolerance which its ambiguities may have seemed to afford for the Lutheran doctrine of the Presence.

Those who understood its language in an anti-Reformed sense might fairly be pronounced to be "mistakers." But it cannot fairly be charged against them that the book afforded no loopholes for their mistakes.

But whatever loopholes for mistake there were in the first book, it is obvious that the revision which we have in the second was distinctly designed to stop them. It can no

longer be said that there is fair room for mistake. When the second book is fairly compared with the first—and the first is to be viewed as made perfect in the second—it is impossible not to see that its perfecting consists in its dealing with ambiguous language, and that its ambiguities have been dealt with in the way of firmly and of set purpose closing the door against the approaches of Lutheran doctrine.

The well-informed among those who most strongly objected to what they regarded as the dangerous ceremonies retained in the English Church did not (I believe) venture afterwards to charge the Communion Service with being anything but a "Reformed" Liturgy.¹

It was intended, indeed, to minister to a great National Church, which was well known to contain a considerable variety of opinion. But we must insist upon it that it was intended to *teach* only the doctrine of the "Reformed." And, still more, we must insist upon it that a sidelight from history makes it perfectly clear that it was of set purpose and of fixed design intended to *unteach* (so far as *omission* could *unteach*), not only the "dangerous deceits" of the Mass, but also the Real Presence as held and taught in the Churches of the Lutherans.

Another question remains to be dealt with in our next chapter.

¹ It is true, indeed, that recently attempts have been made to fasten, on certain expressions of our Liturgy, doctrines which do not belong to "Reformed" Theology. For an answer to the arguments which are relied upon in these attempts, see Appendix, Note A.

CHAPTER III.

SUBSEQUENT REVISIONS.—PART I.

ONE important question remains to be considered: “In what relation does the second book of Edward stand to subsequent Prayer-Books of the English Church?”

For our present purpose it will suffice to accept and endorse the dictum of Bishop Stubbs: “The great historic importance of the third Prayer-Book—that is, the one introduced by the Act of Uniformity of Queen Elizabeth, which to almost all intents and purposes is that which we now use—is that it was a distinct enunciation that the tide of innovation should proceed no further. The changes introduced into it from the second Prayer-Book are very few; but, few as they are, they indicate a return to, rather than a further departure from, the first Prayer-Book”¹ (“Charge” of June, 1890; see *Guardian* of September 3, 1890).

“The Preface,” indeed, inserted at the last review, speaks of the “present” book and the “former” book. And the Act of Uniformity, which establishes our present book, calls it “the appended book.” The Act of Elizabeth authorized no new book at all but Edward’s second book, with certain alterations specified in the Act itself.

¹ To prevent misunderstanding, it may be well to state that, in making this quotation, I am not intending to claim the Bishop’s support for all that is advanced in this article.

The changes, however, made in the book of Elizabeth at the last review (unless for the purposes specified in the Preface) are very few indeed ; and it is scarcely too much to say that their doctrinal significance is inappreciable,¹ except so far as they may be interpreted to be another and a further intimation that the stream of innovation was to be checked.

Alterations, indeed, of some importance were proposed in the Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper, which—perhaps from an overscrupulous dread of concessions to anything like a tendency towards Laudian theology—were deliberately disallowed.²

¹ Moreover, the changes (such as they are) are by no means all in one direction (see “Papers on the Eucharistic Presence,” No. VII., pp. 467, 557-559). Cosin's influence seems to have been controlled by others, and some of the changes, generally supposed to be of a retrogressive character, were really made at the suggestion of the Puritans (see Canon Robertson's “How shall we Conform?” p. 26, and Blakeney on “Common Prayer,” pp. 153-156).

Lord Selborne says: “The influence which Cosin personally exercised over the work of revision cannot be measured (as Mr. Parker seems, in part at least, to measure it) by the number of the changes entered in his ‘book’ [which was, in fact, the original record of the preparation made by the Bishops; see p. 44] which were ultimately adopted. Very many of these changes (whatever may have been their origin) were verbal and trivial. Many others of greater importance were (in one stage or other of the work of Convocation) rejected; and of these, some of the most considerable may be inferred, from their agreement with passages in Cosin's ‘Particulars’ or ‘Notes,’ to have been suggested by him” (“Notes on Liturgical Hist.,” p. 48). Contemporary writers do not include Cosin's name among those to whom they ascribe the prevailing influence (*ibid.*).

See “Eucharistic Presence,” pp. 555-557.

² See editor's Preface to vol. v. of Cosin's Works, A.C.L., p. xxii, and note in same vol., p. 518; also Bulley's “Variations,” pp. 142, 190, 191, 200; also Cardwell's “Conferences,” chap. viii.; Preface to Nicholls's “Common Prayer,” p. x; Burnet's “History of his own Time,” pp. 124-125, edit. Bohn; Blakeney's “Common Prayer,” pp. 143-145; and “Papers on the Eucharistic Presence,” No. VII., pp. 556-557.

Our Communion Service is still the Communion Service of Queen Elizabeth's book.¹ And the authorized book of Queen Elizabeth's reign was professedly the second book of Edward,² with just so much change as indicated a desire to raise a breakwater against the danger of any further rising of the restless tide of disturbing innovation—a tide which was already being encouraged by the ill-informed enthusiasm and misdirected zeal of some dissatisfied and turbulent spirits. There was need for this, as the noble treatise of Richard Hooker and the sad history of subsequent troubles too plainly and sadly testify. But the Communion Service as we have

¹ The Act of Uniformity of 1662 speaks of the book which it authorizes not as a book then made, but as the book of Elizabeth, with certain "additions and alterations."

² On the change in the words of administration, see "Papers on the Eucharistic Presence," No. VII., p. 492, *sqq.*

One important change in the book recommended by Geste (and, as generally believed—though on evidence somewhat slender and mainly conjectural—by a committee of divines) was in an opposite direction. That book left it indifferent to receive the Holy Communion kneeling or standing. In Geste's letter to Cecil the preference is given to standing. To have added the Black Rubric, therefore, would have been altogether out of place. (See Dugdale's "Life of Geste," pp. 39, 40, 149; Collier's "Eccl. Hist.," vol. vi., p. 249; Cardwell's "Conferences," pp. 21, 22, 54; Strype's "Annals," vol. i., chap. iv., p. 83; "Papers on the Eucharistic Presence," p. 466.)

It is much to be regretted that Professor Kurtz, in his valuable and learned "Church History," should have fallen into such a strange mistake as to say that the revision in Queen Elizabeth's reign "practically reproduced the earlier, less perfect of the Prayer-Books of Edward VI." (§ 139, 6, vol. ii., p. 316). Almost equally surprising is his representation of "the Reformation under Elizabeth" as having a "Lutheranizing doctrinal standpoint, and Catholicizing forms of constitution and worship" (p. 374). Not only did Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity establish substantially Edward's second book, but it made "void all laws, statutes, and ordinances whereby any other service had been established" (1 Eliz., chap. ii., § 27), and enacted (§ 4) that "if any parson . . . use any other rite, ceremony" . . . than that set forth in the Prayer-Book, he shall be punished.

it now is substantially what it was as it came from the hands of our Reformers in 1552.

Changing winds and currents of opinion may doubtless have made a slight veering in her swing, but the doctrinal anchorage of the Church of England has not been shifted. Let us thank God that the Prayer-Book of Queen Elizabeth's reign (*i.e.*, the second Prayer-Book of Edward VI.) is our Prayer-Book still, and is a standing witness before the world that the Church of England is "Reformed" still.

It seems needful to insist on these facts at the present time, because, while the "Reformed" character of our earlier Prayer-Book is being more commonly allowed, there seems a strong disposition in certain quarters to assume that quite another character was given to our Liturgy by the last review.

This disposition may be said to be reflected in the following notice, which appeared in the *Guardian* of May 23, 1888 :

"From what has been said, it will have been seen that we should not have thought Dr. Dalton's 'Life of A Lasco' worth reviewing, if it had not been for the opportunity afforded us of correcting an erroneous view common amongst English Churchmen that the English Reformers had more affinity with Luther than Calvin. The author is right, on his own principles, in connecting the English Church rather with the Reformed than the Lutheran communion.¹ We need not fear to proclaim what facts

¹ If evidence of this should be desired, it will be found abundantly in two articles in the *Church Quarterly Review*, October, 1892, and October, 1893.

And if any of our readers should wish to see additional evidence in support of the view maintained in our former articles with respect to the relation of the second book of Edward VI. to the first, he may be referred to Mr. Tomlinson's "Great Parliamentary Debate" (Shaw and Co., London, price 6d.; see especially pp. 19-22), which is a very valuable and important publication, demanding the attention of all who desire to form a true estimate of the earlier history of our Prayer-Book. It makes it quite clear that in 1548 Cranmer and Ridley had already adopted and avowed the doctrinal views which were distinctly impressed on the Book of 1552.

As to the Prayer-Book of Queen Elizabeth, it seems difficult to believe

of history have established undeniably, since the Caroline divines who remodelled the Prayer-Book at the Restoration were neither Lutherans, Zwinglians, nor Calvinists."

that any can seriously suppose that its doctrine differed materially from that of Edward's second book. Yet we find an able writer in the *Church Quarterly Review* of April, 1896 (p. 36), speaking of it thus: "This rite did not ignore the Real Presence, as did that which it superseded. But the sequence of parts, and the language of 1552, both of which had been adopted to shut out the sacrificial ideas for which Gardiner found support in the Mass of 1549, remained unchanged. This might be serious were it not that the English Church . . . repudiates the interpretation of her formularies by any but herself, or except in reference, not to the opinions of the Reformers, but to the ancient and Catholic standards of belief." We are constrained to ask (1) Wherein did the Liturgy of Elizabeth differ from that of 1552 in respect of the Real Presence (perhaps the omission of the added Black Rubric is referred to, about which see below); and (2) How could the English Church in her Eucharistic service more clearly manifest her own interpretation both of her own formularies, and of "the ancient and Catholic standards of belief," than by retaining what she had adopted for the purpose of shutting out the sacrificial ideas which "mistakers" had read into the office of 1549?

That there was influential preference manifested for Edward's *first* book (which is the natural, if not necessary, inference from the letter of Geste to Cecil; see especially Dugdale's "Life of Geste," pp. 143, 146, 147) only makes the return to the *second* book more significant.

It is evident that, in spite of temporary pressure, the second book was restored in deliberate preference to the first book. And the Act of Uniformity (which in the House of Lords only passed by a majority of three) may be commended to the study of those who would make much of the Liturgical changes which were introduced. It ought to be observed (though it appears to have escaped notice) that the Act, specifying the alterations made, makes no mention of the Black Rubric or its omission. So that, if the Rubric had been strictly a part of the Prayer-Book as established by law in King Edward's reign (which constitutionally it was not), it would have been strictly a part of the Prayer-Book as established by law in Queen Elizabeth's reign. The law which made the changes made no change whatever in this. So that, *on this supposition*, Bishop Hall was not so far wrong in judging that the rubric had been "upon negligence omitted in the impression" (see "Documents relating to Act of Uniformity," p. 317; London, 1862).

We may thankfully recognise such a truthful and candid acknowledgment of that which the facts of history have made plain concerning the Reformation of the English Church.

And all that is here stated may be very freely conceded. But, then, it must also be conceded that the facts of history have not less clearly established the fact that the Prayer-Book of 1662 (as regards its Eucharistic teaching) had no new doctrinal character impressed upon it.

Those who regard the doctrinal teaching of our present book as so far removed from that of Elizabeth's book can only make good their position by showing clearly two things : (1) *first*, that the doctrinal views of the principal revisers were in accordance with what is now spoken of as the "Catholic" doctrine of the Eucharist, and (2) *secondly*, that they were successful in introducing into the book the changes which they desired as expressive of their views.¹

But it may be confidently affirmed (1) that what may be called the innovating party, in their desire to introduce somewhat observable changes, were defeated in their attempts all

¹ It seems surprising that so much should be made of changes "contemplated and definitely proposed" (Walton's "Rubrical Determination," p. 25 ; see also pp. 35, 36 ; edit. 2), but *never made*, as evidence of the "Catholic" character of the Revised Prayer-Book.

From a common-sense point of view it would surely seem that whatever amount of evidence is adduced to show that any attempt was made and pressed to alter in any measure the doctrine of the Prayer-Book *without success*, is just so much evidence that the revision not only did not receive the new doctrinal impress desired, but also did deliberately decline to accept it.

When we read the note in Sancroft's handwriting, "My Lords the Bishops at Ely House ordered all in the old method," we surely have before us evidence of an effort checkmated. The proposal to return in some important particulars (which might well have been allowed but for the danger of opening a door for possible doctrinal misconception) to the form of Edward's first book was not only not allowed ; it was disallowed.

along the line, and (2) that these innovators themselves, in their desire for what they regarded as liturgical improvements, had no thought or desire to make room for the introduction of Lutheran or Romish doctrine, either as regards the Presence or the Sacrifice.¹

¹ No one, I am persuaded, would have more decidedly repudiated the notion of a Presence of Christ in or under the forms of the elements, to be adored by the faithful, and offered to God the Father, than Cosin himself. I give a few extracts in evidence: (1) "Negamus sacramentum, extra usum a Deo institutum, rationem habere sacramenti, in quo Christus reservari aut circumgestari debeat, aut possit, quum communicantibus tantum adsit" ("Hist. Trans.", cap. iv., § v.; in Works, A.C.L., vol. iv., p. 49). (2) "Cum poculum nonnisi sacramentali metonymia possit esse illud testamentum, planum fit, nec panem aliter esse posse Corpus Christi" (*ibid.*, cap. v., § v., p. 58). (3) "Aliis vero, tam non recipientibus quam non credentibus, licet Antitypon sit, tamen illis nequam est nec fit Corpus Christi. Nemo enim absque fide Christum manducat" (*ibid.*, cap. v., § xv., p. 66). (4) "Because the body and blood is neither sensibly present (nor *otherwise AT ALL PRESENT*, but only to them who are duly prepared to receive them, and in the very act of receiving them and the consecrated elements together, to which they are sacramentally in that act united), the adoration is then and there given to Christ Himself; *neither is nor ought to be directed to any external sensible object*, such as are the *blessed elements*" (in Nicholls' "Additional Notes on Communion Service," p. 49). (5) Of *elevation* Bishop Cosin says: "Which rite neither we, nor any of the Reformed or Protestant Churches, observe, but (*in regard of the PERIL OF IDOLATRY*) have wholly omitted it" (*ibid.*, p. 47). (6) "Our kneeling," he says, "is ordained *only* to testify and express the inward reverence and devotion of our souls toward our blessed Saviour" (*ibid.*, p. 49). See also "Real Presence of Laudian Theology," pp. 46, 47, 58.

For evidence of Cosin's views of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, see "Missarum Sacrificia," pp. 162-166.

Other language of Cosin which may be thought to have a different sound can be matched from the writings of Calvin and Turretin. See "Real Presence of the Laudian Theology," pp. 47, 58, 59. See also p. 52. As to the earlier series of notes which has been attributed to Cosin, see "Missarum Sacrificia," p. 3.

And even Thorndike (notwithstanding his "particular notion in this matter"; see Wake in Gibson's "Preservative," vol. x., p. 75, edit.

Indeed, the history of the revision is (in part) the history of a remarkable failure of well-meant endeavours (endeavours

1848) would have entirely rejected the notion of any "real and essential" Presence of Christ's Body and Blood to be adored in the elements.

Witness the following: "Though the Sacrament of the Eucharist may be the occasion to determine the circumstance of the worshipping of Christ, yet is it itself no way capable of any worship that may be counted religious, because religion enjoineth it. Cardinal Bellarmine . . . would have it said, that the sign is worshipped materially, but the body and blood of Christ formally, in the Eucharist: which are terms that signify nothing. . . . Therefore the sign in the Eucharist seems only to determine why that worship, which is always everywhere due, is here now tendered" (vol. iv., part 2, p. 757, A.C.L.).

"If in the proper dimensions thereof [*i.e.*, of Christ's body] He 'parted from' His disciples, and 'went,' was 'carried,' or lifted and 'taken up into heaven'; . . . if 'the heavens must receive Him till' that time; . . . if to that purpose He 'leave the world' . . . 'no more' to be 'in' it . . . so that we shall have Him no more with us, . . . it behoveth us to understand how we are informed, *that the promise of His body and blood IN THE EUCHARIST imports an EXCEPTION to so many declarations, before we believe it.* Indeed, there is no place of God's right hand, by sitting down at which we may say that our Lord's body becomes confined to the said place; but seeing the flesh of Christ is taken up into heaven to sit down at God's right hand (though by His sitting down at God's right hand we understand the man Christ to be put into the exercise of that Divine power and command which His Mediator's office requires), yet His body *we must understand to be confined to that place*, where the majesty of God appears to those that attend upon His throne. Neither shall the appearing of Christ to St. Paul (Acts xxiii. 11) be any exception to this appointment. He that would insist, indeed, that the body of Christ stood over Paul in the castle where then he lodged, *must say* that it *left heaven* for that purpose" (vol. iv., part 1, pp. 47, 48).

Of Gunning, indeed, it is said by Neal that "being very fond of the Popish rituals and ceremonies, he was very much set upon reconciling the Church of England to Rome" ("Hist. of Puritans," vol. iii., p. 92). But this saying must be qualified by the account of Burnet: "He was much set on the reconciling us with Popery *in some points.*" He was suspected of an inclination to go over to them. "But," says Burnet, "he was *far from it*; and was a very honest, sincere man, but of no sound judgment" ("Own Time," p. 124; London, 1857). Dean Luckock claims for him that "his views on ecclesiastical questions were thoroughly catholic"

with which many "Reformed" Churchmen might well have sympathized), yet a failure for which we may now be devoutly thankful.

In saying this, I am not forgetting that the verbal changes in the Black Rubric have recently had given them an amazing importance as indicating something like a complete doctrinal revolution. But the claim for such significance may be taken, I think, as an example of the feebleness of the position which has to be maintained by those who regard the last review as restoring a "Catholic" character to our previously "Reformed" Liturgy.

The insertion of the Black Rubric at all may fairly be set down among the evidences that the *animus* of the Episcopal Commissioners, as displayed in the Savoy Conference, was not the *animus* which governed the subsequent revision.¹

("Studies," p. 168). And perhaps of no divine of his day could the claim be more safely made. Yet, on the subject of the Eucharistic Presence, few "Catholics" now, I presume, would think of subscribing to his views as represented by Burnet.

¹ The insertion is attributed by Bishop Burnet to the influence of Gauden, who (by the testimony of Baxter, "Reliquiae Baxterianæ," p. 363, London, 1696) was the "most constant helper" to the Presbyterian divines (Neal confirms this testimony, "Hist. of Puritans," vol. iii., p. 92). Burnet says in a MS. vol. of his "Own Time" (Harleian MSS., 6584)—"There were some small Alterations made in ye Book of Common Prayer (together with some additions), the most important was yt concerning ye kneeling in ye sacrament, whch had been putt in ye Second Book of Comon Prayer set out by Edward ye 6th, but was left out by Queen Elizabeth, and was now by Bishop Gawden's means put in at ye end of ye office of ye Communion. Sheldon opposed it, but Gawden was seconded by Southampton and Morley. The Duke complained of this much to me, as a puritannical thing, and spake severely of Gawden, as a popular man, for his procuring it to be added (tho' I have been told yt it was used in King James's time)" (quoted from Perry's "Declaration on Kneeling," p. 302. See also pp. 71, 72).

But it is urged that the change made in the rubric was due to D. P. G., supposed to be Doctor Peter Gunning, who is said to have held that

The somewhat unyielding temper shown in the Conference was certainly overruled in the revision by wiser counsels.¹

“there was a *Cilinder* of a *Vacuum* made between the elements and Christ’s body in heaven” (*ibid.*, p. 71). But, if this were so, will anyone believe that what Burnet calls “such a solemn piece of folly as this,” which, he says, “can hardly be read without indignation,” moved the revising authorities in making or allowing the change? If we must believe that Gunning held such an incredible notion, and if even we were to grant that he was, in consequence of this notion, moved to propose the alteration of language in the rubric, are we therefore to believe that the revisers, in acceding to the proposal and accepting the change, were making themselves accessories to the propagation of such an absurdity? And could such a notion have been regarded, even by Gunning himself, as a “real and essential Presence”? We are not concerned with the follies of an eccentric individual, but with the principles which governed the revision.

¹ Mr. Parker has shown, as the result of a careful investigation, that “the discussions at the Savoy Conference had practically very little influence upon the corrections made during the revision of the Prayer-Book, either by the committee or by Convocation” (“Introduction to the Revisions,” p. ccvii).

It would be a mistake, however, to suppose that the exceptions of the Presbyterians were out of view or utterly disregarded by the revisers. The committee of eight Bishops which met at Ely House each evening, with something like plenipotentiary powers (see Lord Selborne’s “Notes,” p. 46), included five who had been Savoy Commissioners. (I think Lord Selborne is mistaken in including Wren among the Savoy Commissioners.)

Lord Selborne maintains that “Cosin’s Book” (representing the mind not of Cosin only, but of others, his fellow-labourers in the work) was made up, and assumed the character which alone gives it importance, during the interval between the close of the Savoy Conference and the meeting of Convocation on the 21st day of November (“Liturgy of English Church,” p. 43). But this need not hinder our believing that many entries may have been previously made (see Parker’s “Letter to Lord Selborne,” p. 110).

We are assured by Lord Clarendon (“Life,” vol. ii., p. 118) that “the Bishops had spent the vacation in making such alterations in the Book of Common Prayer as they thought would make it more grateful to the dissenting brethren” (see Lord Selborne’s “Notes,” p. 43).

Bishop White Kennett, in his enumeration of “the concessions and alterations that were now made for reforming the Book of Common Prayer,” specifies twenty particulars, all of which he regards as due to objections or proposals of the Presbyterian divines (see “Register,” pp.

The utterance of the Bishops (*i.e.*, of the majority of the leading Episcopal Commissioners at the Savoy) may be taken, I believe, as the voice of the extremest reactionary influence of the day.¹

585, 586; London, 1728). Then he adds a paragraph mentioning other amendments, in the margin of which he writes: "Many other Alterations and Corrections made in the Liturgy, sufficient to have satisfied all reasonable men."

¹ Of some of these (especially of those most regular in attendance, and most prominent in the "disputation") Baxter (whose words seem to have been too often provoking) speaks strongly and somewhat bitterly. Sheldon (then Bishop of London), though silent when present (which was very seldom), and Morley ("and next Bishop Henchman") were supposed to be "the doers and disposers" of all matters. Morley was overbearing. Henchman, though speaking calmly, "as high in his principles and resolutions as any." Sanderson seldom spoke, "his aged peevishness not unknown." Sterne, "of a most sober, honest, mortified aspect," spake only a "weak, uncharitable word"; "so that I was never more deceived by a man's face." Cosin would have consented to "moderating concessions" of Gauden; but "the rest came in the end and brake them all." A few words were spoken by three Bishops who were "no Commissioners." The remainder of the Bishops appear to have been seldom or never present, and when present to have spoken little.

Of the coadjutor divines, Baxter makes mention of Earle, Heylyn, and Barwick as never present; of Hacket as saying "nothing to make us know anything of him"; of Sparrow as saying little, "but that little with a spirit enough for the imposing dividing cause"; of Pierson and Gunning as "doing all their work"; of Pierson [Pearson] as "the strength and honour of that cause which we doubted whether he heartily maintained," "being but once in any passion"; of Gunning as (with "passionate invectives") "so vehement for his high imposing principles, and so over-zealous for Arminianism and Formality and Church Pomp, and so very eager and fervent in his discourse, that I conceive his Prejudice and Passion much perverted his judgment" (*"Reliquiae Baxterianæ,"* pp. 363, 364; London, 1696).

It has been asserted that changes, some trifling, some of the utmost importance, were made in the House of Lords (see Lord Selborne's "Notes," p. 62), but there are proofs complete to the contrary (*ibid.*, pp. 60, 61). And there is evidence that the book was sent by the King to the House of Lords in exactly the same state in which he had received it from Convocation (*ibid.*, p. 58).

The Puritans desired the restoration of the Rubric "for the vindicating of our Church in the matter of kneeling at the Sacrament" (Cardwell's "Conferences," p. 322).

The Bishops were indisposed to make the concession. Their answer was: "This rubric is not in the Liturgy of Queen Elizabeth, nor confirmed by law; nor is there any great need of restoring it, the world being now in more danger of profanation than of idolatry" (Cardwell, p. 354).

But did the Bishops, representing the strongest opposition to the Puritans, object at all to the *doctrine* of the Black Rubric? Had they any fault to find with its teaching as it stood unaltered, and as quoted in its entirety by the Presbyterian opponents?

Let the following words, which form the conclusion of their answer, give evidence: "Besides, the sense of it is declared sufficiently in the 28th Article of the Church of England."¹

None, I would hope, will think of accusing the Bishops of such gross insincerity and prevarication as must be put down to their charge if we are to suppose that they were secretly in their hearts objecting to the doctrinal teaching of the

¹ This statement clearly amounts to a declaration that in the view of the Bishops the adoration of "any real and essential Presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood" would be idolatry.

It also amounts to a declaration that in their view the 28th Article excludes "any real and essential Presence there being" as much as any "corporal Presence" of "Christ's natural flesh and blood."

It will therefore be seen that the importance of this statement (which seems to have been too commonly overlooked) can hardly be exaggerated. It was clearly understood by the "ministers" (as, indeed, it could not be otherwise understood) as a true witness to the Reformed doctrine of the Church of England. In their "Rejoinder" they do but "reply": "Can there be any hurt or danger in the people's being taught to understand the Church aright?" ("Documents relating to Act of Uniformity," p. 317; London, 1862).

rubric, while professing only that its teaching was superfluous, because its sense was sufficiently declared in one of our Articles.

And if the Bishops did not object to the doctrinal statement of the unrevised rubric, who did?¹ None, we may be sure, among those to whom the revision owed its guidance.

But then, it will be asked, how are we to account for the change of the term "real and essential Presence" to "corporal Presence"? I answer—Merely by taking into account the fact that since the first insertion of the rubric a very observable and somewhat remarkable change (the result of continual controversial skirmishing) had come over, not the doctrine, but the use of language² concerning the Eucharist in the teaching of Reformed theologians, as well abroad as at home, and as well among Puritans as among Churchmen.

In the language commonly in use in King Edward's days

¹ In the P.C. judgment in the Bennett case their lordships say: "It is at least probable that, as the declaration itself was introduced in order to conciliate scruples in one quarter, the alteration made in it was designed to remove objections entertained against it in another" (p. 296, edit. Stephens). I hope I may without presumption be allowed to ask, Is there any evidence at all of any objections from any quarter (except the Papists) to the *doctrine* of the rubric as it stood?

If it should be pleaded that the words of Woodhead (see below) imply an apprehension on his part that some of "our English divines" *did* assert a doctrine of some "real, essential, and substantial Presence there being," as distinct from a "corporal Presence," and that the rubric was changed by these divines with the view of sheltering such a notion (the absurdity of which design he himself exposes)—then the best answer to such a plea will be found in the replies of Aldridge and Wake, by both of whom such an apprehension is treated as altogether a misapprehension, and by Wake the idea is repudiated as "vainly and falsely suggested" (see below).

² Thus Dean Aldrich says: "The Protestants in King Henry VIII.'s time that suffered upon the Six Articles denied the *real Presence* (*i.e.*, the Popish sense of it), but meant the same thing with us, who think we may lawfully use that term" ("Reply to Two Discourses," p. 17; Oxford, 1687).

“real and essential Presence” signified a mediæval doctrine rejected and repudiated by our Reformers. It was a term belonging to the later mediæval phraseology which was in common use among Romanists to express a Roman doctrine. As frequently used in days preceding the last review, the phrase “real Presence” was in constant use among the “Reformed” to signify that true doctrine which our Reformers and their successors had uniformly contended for.¹

In 1662, to condemn the phrase “real Presence” would have been to condemn not only such men as Hooker, and Bishop Andrewes, and Cosin, and Morton, and Jeremy Taylor, and Bishop Reynolds, but also many eminent Swiss divines abroad, as well as the divines of the Westminster Confession of Faith at home.²

¹I must be allowed to refer my readers to my “Papers on the Eucharistic Presence,” pp. 578-586 (see also pp. 472, 473), for evidence of the following propositions:—

(1) In the earlier period of the Reformed Church the phrase “real Presence” unexplained was usually rejected by our Reformers.

(2) When in the earlier period the phrase “real Presence” or “real essential Presence” was accepted, it was with explanation, in which explanation the “corporal” Presence was commonly distinctly excluded.

(3) When subsequent “Reforming” divines appropriated the phrase “real Presence,” they did not appropriate the phrase “corporal Presence.”

(4) The phrase “corporal Presence” was accepted by Lutherans as signifying the doctrine held in common by themselves and the Roman Church (see Goode, “On Eucharist,” ii., p. 624).

(5) The distinction was clearly recognised (between “real Presence” accepted and “corporal Presence” rejected) by divines who were engaged in the last review, and by subsequent divines, whose *doctrine* knew no change from the doctrine of the Reformation (concerning Thorndike, see Aldrich’s “Reply to Two Discourses,” pp. 19, 61, and Wake’s “Discourse of the Holy Eucharist,” pp. 69, 70, 90; see also “Theology of Bishop Andrewes,” pp. 10, 11, 14-17, and “Eucharistic Worship,” pp. 39-43, and “Real Presence of the Laudian Theology,” p. 55). See Appendix, Note B.

²Indeed, it may be said to have been the necessary result of their controversial position in view of the assaults of the Lutherans (as the true

Was it not, then, a very natural and right and suitable thing to substitute for "real and essential" the word "corporal," seeing that when "Reformed" divines claimed and appropriated to their own doctrine the phrase "real Presence," they did not thus claim and appropriate the phrase "corporal Presence," which was thus left (rejected by the "Reformed" and accepted by the Lutherans) to express that Romish doctrine of a Presence *sub speciebus* which at an earlier period had been generally designated by the phrase "real Presence"?

Have we not here at least a reasonable and intelligible account of this change of expression?

And have we—let me be allowed to ask—a reasonable and intelligible account to give of the variation in language, if we suppose it to result from a determination to change the doctrine of the rubric?

I must venture to ask those who think so, just to read carefully through the whole rubric, with the special view of seeing how it will agree with such an hypothesis.¹

Does not the very structure of the rubric itself render a

status controversiæ became cleared of surrounding mists), that the Reformed found themselves compelled to take within their line of defences the term "real Presence" (for how should they maintain a true fruition by the soul of that which they refused to say was really *in any sense* present to the soul? how should that be verily and indeed taken and received and eaten by faith, which is not really present to faith?), though, as occasion required, limiting its sense by the qualifying word "spiritual" (as opposed to "corporal"), that qualification being understood and explained as signifying that the Presence is (not, as Romanists would sometimes use it or allow it, *a Presence of a body after the manner of a spirit*, but) a Presence to our spirits only, a Presence to the heart which spiritually eats and drinks, a Presence only to the faith of the believer.

¹ See "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," pp. 469-475. The need of the distinction between the two possible senses of "real" (*i.e.*, "true" and "corporal") was clearly seen, and clearly expressed by Cranmer in his disputation at Oxford thus—"If ye understand by this word 'really,'

purpose of changing the *doctrinal statement* absolutely inconceivable?

Let it be carefully considered what such a change would amount to. It would be a designed rejection of the previous statement, admitting its contradictory (see P.C. Judgment in Bennett case, p. 289, edit. Stephens).

But the contradictory of the previous statement would be that adoration may be done to a *real and essential* Presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood—the amended statement still declaring that no adoration ought to be done to any *corporal* Presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood.

The effect of the change of statement would obviously be to make a distinction between a real and essential Presence (not to the soul, but upon the table), and a corporal Presence there, allowing adoration to the one, and refusing it to the other.¹

But the whole argument of the rubric will be found to apply as much to the exclusion of adoration to the one as to the other. If the rubric allows adoration to a real and 're ipsa,' i.e., in very deed and effectually, so Christ by the grace and efficacy of His Passion is indeed and truly present to all His true and holy members. But if ye understand by this word 'really' 'corporaliter,' i.e., 'corporally,' so that by the body of Christ is understood a natural body and organical, so the first proposition doth vary, not only from the usual speech and phrase of scripture, but also is clear contrary to the holy Word of God and Christian profession" (Foxe's "Acts and Mon.," vol. vi., p. 446).

And one of the charges under which he suffered was the denial, not of the *real*, but of the *corporal* Presence—"Christum in Eucharistia spiritualiter tantum et non corporaliter esse, sed in corpore in cælo tantum esse, et non alibi" (Strype's "Cranmer," vol. ii., p. 1075, Oxford edit.). See Goode's "Tract XC. Historically Refuted," pp. 75, 76. And note how this charge is exactly the charge of teaching the doctrine of the Black Rubric—the charge using the word "corporaliter" to express (it will hardly be questioned) what in the rubric was meant by "any *real and essential* presence."

¹ See Bishop Trower's "Pastoral Letter," pp. 15, 30-39, London, 1858; and Goode, "On Eucharist," p. 625.

essential Presence in the elements, then the order of kneeling is certainly not well meant for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ given in the Lord's Supper to all worthy receivers; and further, not only is it foolish to argue from the statement of Christ's natural body and blood being in heaven, but it is actually untrue to declare that they are in heaven and *not here*. And then, further still, it cannot be maintained that it is against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one.

On the hypothesis of the doctrinal statement being thus changed to admit of the teaching of the adorable Presence of Christ's Body really and essentially present after the manner of a spirit in the elements, it will be found that there is a cause for the statement appended to the statement, which alleged cause is not only inapplicable to the statement, but is actually destructive of it.¹

But further: looking at the object of the rubric, it cannot be denied that, upon the supposition of such an intentional change of the doctrinal statement, the whole rubric would have been a miserable delusion, an attempt to put to rest men's suspicions by a declaration, which declaration in its changed form (with the change so understood), instead of removing suspicions, would not merely have aggravated them, but have raised the fiercest opposition. Such an attempt at public deception is not only incredible, it would have been worthy of infamy.

¹ Hence it must be evident that there is in the rubric itself sufficient confutation of the idea that it intends only to exclude what may be called the gross doctrine of the "Ego Berengarius" (in its natural sense), to which some Romish divines had given the name of "esse corporaliter," and which (speaking generally) had long ago been rejected by the Scholastic Theology (see Goode on Tract XC., pp. 111, 112, 113; and Bishop of St. Andrews on Cheyne's "Appeal," pp. 28, 29; Edinburgh, 1858).

CHAPTER IV.

SUBSEQUENT REVISIONS.—PART II.

My readers will probably judge that sufficient evidence has been adduced against the arguments of those who imagine that a doctrinal innovation has been introduced into our Liturgy by the change of expression in the Black Rubric. But there is somewhat more which ought to be added. Indeed, the absurdity of supposing that the change of expression is to be attributed to a change of doctrine was ably exposed by the Romanist, Abraham Woodhead, who wrote: “I say, if the words of the former rubric, *real* and *essential*, were by the late clergy changed into *corporal* on any such design, that so the *real* and *essential* Presence might be still by them maintained; then I ask here, How can the same reason be still retained in their opinions thus altered? For this reason [*that the same body cannot be at once in several places*] . . . combats as well a *real* and *essential* Presence, which they now would seem to allow, as a *corporal*, which they reject” (“Two Discourses,” p. 19; London, 1687). And again: “In my apprehension, either these our English divines must affirm this proposition of *one body at the same time being in more places than one*, or some other equivalent to it, to be true; or else must cease to assert any *real*, *essential*, or *substantial* Presence of Christ’s Body in the

Eucharist, contradistinct to the sense of the Zwinglians" (*ibid.*, p. 20).

And the true state of the case was clearly set out in Dean Aldrich's "Reply": "He tells us in King Edward's book [the rubric] denied a *real* and *essential*, but now denies only a *corporal Presence*. To which I answer that King Edward's rubric by *real* and *essential* means (as the Papists then used to do) a *real* and *bodily Presence*, as is plain by the *Articles*¹ set forth about the same time" ("Reply to Two Discourses," p. 9; Oxford, 1687).

Again he says: "It is . . . evident that when we say Christ is *present*, or *adorable*, in the *Sacrament*, we do not mean *in the elements*, but in the celebration. We affirm His natural Body to be locally in heaven and not here; and that we, who are here and not in heaven, ought to worship it as *locally present in heaven*, while we celebrate the Holy Sacrament upon earth" (*ibid.*, p. 17).

And again—vindicating a *real* as distinguished from a *corporal* presence—he says: "We take the Bishop's [Andrewes] words, *Præsentiam credimus; nec minus quam vos, veram*; and his meaning, that the spiritual Presence, which

¹ It is worthy of special observation that the change of expression in the rubric was but a return to the original language of the Latin Article (28) of 1553 [“carnis ejus et sanguinis Realem et Corporalem (ut loquuntur) præsentiam”]. So that (as Dr. Blakeney observes, “On Common Prayer,” 3rd edit., p. 434) “the revisers of 1661 in the word *corporal* selected the very term which was chosen by our Reformers to express their meaning in the article from which the declaration is taken.” (See “Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church,” p. 567.)

It should be noted also that the change of expression is but one among a great number of verbal alterations made in the rubric as adopted at the last review.

And, further, it will be well to read in connection the following among the reasons given for changes in the Preface of 1662: “for the more proper expression of some words or phrases of ancient usage in terms more suitable to the language of the present times.”

we hold, is as *real* as the *corporal* which the *Papists* hold: and I hope we need not stay to prove a thing so manifest, and so universally agreed upon, as that what is spiritual is as real as what is corporal" (*ibid.*, p. 25).

I will add yet one other extract, which is valuable as giving not only a commentary on the rubric, but also virtually a sufficient account of the change in its language: "I will tell him [Abraham Woodhead] that the King's [James I.], the Bishop's [Andrewes], and the Church's meaning is very plain, *viz.*, that since Christ's natural Body is not to be adored but where it is corporally and locally present, and it is not so present in the Eucharist, that therefore in the Sacrament (*i.e.*, in the celebration) the worthy communicant, to whose soul that Body is really present, is to adore the person of Christ in heaven, where alone His Body is locally present. This I doubt the author very well knew, and saw that it was no way contrary to the declaration" ("Reply to Two Discourses," p. 34; Oxford, 1687).

I might further strengthen my position by appealing to the authority of Archbishop Wake, who, in replying to the same "Two Discourses," says: "It were an easy matter to show how constant our Church has been to the doctrine of the *true, real, spiritual Presence*, which it still asserts, and which it derived from its first Reformers" ("Discourse of the Holy Eucharist," p. 71; London, 1687). He declares "that the alterations which have been made in our rubric were not upon the account of our divines changing their opinions, as is vainly and falsely suggested" (*ibid.*, p. 72). He says: "Because the chiefest mystery he thinks lies in this, that whereas in King Edward's days the rubric called it an *essential Presence*, which we have now turned into *corporeal*. I must confess that I will not undertake to say what the occasion of it was. If they thought this latter manner more

free from giving offence than the other would have been, I think they did well to prefer it”¹ (*ibid.*, p. 76).

I might add the testimony of Archbishop Tenison, who tells us that the rejected expression “real and essential” was “subject to misconstruction” (“On Idolatry,” p. 181; Lon-

¹ It should be well observed that L’Estrange, writing before the review, calls the rubric in its old form “this excellent rubric, anciently called ‘a protestation touching the gesture of kneeling’” (“Alliance of Divine Offices,” p. 329, edit. Oxford); and that Bishop White Kennett (in his “Register and Chronicle,” p. 585; London, 1728), enumerating “the concessions and alterations,” mentions the insertion of the rubric as a concession to the Presbyterians, but takes no notice whatever of any change in the rubric. His words are: “IX. They [the Presbyterian divines] desired that a rubric in the Common Prayer-Book in 5 and 6 Edward VI. for the vindicating of our Church in the matter of kneeling at the Sacrament, without adoration, etc., might be restored, and it was so.”

So also Collier, in his “Ecclesiastical History,” takes no account at all of any change, but says: “To satisfy these scruples, the Church thought fit to condescend so far as to restore the rubric of King Edward’s reign above mentioned” (vol. v., p. 436).

The same may be said of Durel in his “*Vindiciæ Eccl. Anglicanæ*.” And Neal speaks of the rubric as it was in the book of Edward (which he regards as “expunged” in Elizabeth’s reign) as declaring that no adoration was intended to any *corporal* Presence (“History of Puritans,” vol. i., p. 97. See also vol. iii., p. 96, London, 1837).

[With this compare the language of Knox, “Such as in that action adore any *corporal* or *real* presence of Christ’s natural body, which is not there, but in heaven” (Lorimer’s “John Knox,” p. 159).]

Baxter, also speaking of the Conformists, tells us: “As for the ceremonies, they say that kneeling is freed from all suspicion of idolatry by the annexing of the rubric of our King Edward VI.’s Common Prayer-Book, which, though the Convocation refused, yet the Parliament annexed; and they are the imposers, and it is their sense that we must stand to. And as it is lawful to kneel in accepting a sealed pardon from the King by his messenger, so is it in accepting a sealed pardon from God with the investiture of our privileges” (“*Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*,” p. 390).

That Baxter’s *history* appears to be mistaken does not invalidate his testimony to the fact that no doctrinal change appears to have been seen or suspected in the appended rubric.

don, 1678). He adds, "Real it is, if it be present in its real effects, and they are the essence of it so far as a Communicant doth receive it." He also declares that "this Rubric doth in effect charge the Church of Rome with gross idolatry" (p. 180; see also p. 185).

To all this might be added the further testimony of Archbishop Secker, who wrote: "It is true we kneel at the Sacrament as they [Romanists] do, but for a very different purpose, not to acknowledge 'any Corporal Presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood,' as our Church, to prevent all possibility of misconception, expressly declares, adding that 'His body is in heaven and not here'; but to worship Him, who is everywhere present, the invisible God. And this portion of kneeling we by no means look upon as in itself necessary, but as a very becoming appointment, and very fit to accompany the prayers and praises which we offer up at the instant of receiving, and to express that inward spirit of piety and humility on which our partaking worthily of this ordinance, and receiving benefit from it, depend" ("Lectures on Cat.," vol. ii., pp. 252, 253, edit. 1769).

Much more evidence to the same effect will be found in "Eucharistic Presence," pp. 571-578.

Here we may very well leave the subject of the Black Rubric. But what about other alterations?

It is not intended at all to represent the changes of 1662 as being all and altogether in one direction.¹ Who is there

¹ Witness the change in the preface to the ordinal (and in the ordinal itself) and see Cardwell's "Conferences," p. 388. But though some of these, such as the substitution of "church" for "congregation" (which, however, was but following the use of Baxter's own book), and the specific mention of "bishops, priests, and deacons," may have tended to produce irritation in the excited state of some minds, yet it will be found, I believe, that the general feeling of discontent on the part of the Presbyterian party was much rather (as in the case of the Hampton Court Conference)

because of disappointment at the insufficiency of the concessions to meet their expectations (which had been unduly raised) than because of any trifling (however from a Churchman's point of view desirable) changes in an opposite direction.

The Presbyterians at the Savoy had desired that the word "minister" should be substituted for "priest." And it must doubtless have been distasteful to them to find "priest" substituted for "minister" in the rubric before the absolution. But it should be observed that the reply of the Episcopal Commissioners does not claim for the word "priest" any sacrificial character, but simply points out the need of some such word to distinguish the orders of the ministry, and to preclude the "deacon" from functions which do not belong to the diaconate. They allege that it is "unreasonable that the word *minister* should only be used in the Liturgy, since some parts might be performed by a deacon, others by none under the order of a priest—viz., absolution and consecration. It was fit, therefore, that some such word as 'priest' should be used for these offices, and not 'minister,' which signified at large everyone that ministered in that holy office, of whatsoever order he might be."

Mr. Perry has observed that the word *priest* is still retained in the rubrics "before prayers which it has never been doubted that a deacon may use" ("History of Church of England," vol. ii., p. 345). It may be added that in Durel's "Latin Prayer-Book" "presbyter" occurs one hundred and sixty times, "sacerdos" never (see Marshall's "Latin Prayer-Book of Charles II.," p. 47). This translation was made in conformity with the Act of Uniformity. And though no claim can be made for it as either faultless, or properly authorized, it was regarded by Bishop Barlow as an *interpretation* of the English Liturgy, and the fact that it was submitted to Sancroft (than whom very few could be better judges of the intention of the revisers) must be allowed to give it a high interpretative value on such a point. It should, however, be noted that Dupont's Greek version (dedicated to Archbishop Sheldon), published in 1665, does not thus shun the use of *ἱερεὺς*. It follows very much the Greek version of Petley (1638), which was dedicated to Archbishop Laud.

As for the change in the rubric before the confession, limiting the rehearsal to "one of the ministers," which before had been allowed to one of the communicants, it was only conceding what the Presbyterians had asked in these words, "We desire it may be made by the minister only" (Cardwell, p. 319).

On the other hand, the introduction of the word "offertory" ("Then shall the priest return to the Lord's Table and begin the offertory"—see Scudamore's "Notitia Euch.," p. 342, 2nd edit.), and perhaps also of the term "oblations" (on which see Harrison on Rubrics, pp. 353-357;

Scudamore, "Notitia," p. 409; Robertson on Liturgy, pp. 185-189; and Marshall's "Latin Prayer-Book of Charles II.," pp. 61-80), in view of this complaint "touching innovation" (1641)—"By introducing an offertory before the Communion, distinct from the giving of alms to the poor" (see Cardwell's "Conferences," p. 273), and of the exception of the Presbyterians at the Savoy: "Collection for the poor may be better made at or a little before the departing of the communicants" (*ibid.*, p. 319)—can hardly have been otherwise than distasteful to the prejudices of the Puritans. In Baxter's Liturgy there appears no direction for any collection or offering of any alms or oblations, except a rubric after the delivery, leaving it "to the minister's discretion . . . at what season to take the contribution for the poor." And in the "Directory" the only notice on the subject is the following admonition at the close of the service: "The collection for the poor is so to be ordered that no part of the public worship be thereby hindered." It is curious to observe that these Puritan objections are as the echo of an ancient liturgical authority—"De collectis vero in usum pauperum, auctor est expositor Ord. R. eas opportuno tempore non inter officium Missarum fieri debere" (Cassander, "Liturgica," cap. xxvii., Op., p. 62, Paris, 1616; see also p. 61). Canon Dixon regards the prayer as now confused "by the offertory, which belonged to the Ordinary, being introduced among the oblations" ("History of Church of England," vol. iii., p. 30). But it should be observed that the Mozarabic rubric after the oblation of the Host and Chalice is this: "Let the priest turn to the people, and let them make their offering, if willing, and let the choir sing the 'Sacrificium'" (*i.e.*, the anthem answering to the offertory). See Simmonds' "Lay Folks' Mass-Book," p. 231; see also the "Missa Gothica" of Archbishop Lorenzana, p. 100, Angelopoli, 1770; Neale's "Essays on Liturgiology," p. 148; and Warren's "Celtic Ritual," p. 130. Indeed, the offering of charitable gifts together with the bread and wine was doubtless a very ancient custom, out of which may probably have arisen the curious practice of the Greeks. (See Goar, "Euchologion," p. 101; Venice 1730.) In the Armenian service, however, there appears now to be no offering of any oblations, except of the elements to be consecrated. Mr. Hammond has noted that in the Ambrosian use the first and second oblations are united ("Liturgies," p. xxxii). And it will be seen that in the Ethiopic Liturgy the first oblation, including alms, is followed immediately by the second (*ibid.*, pp. 241, 244). Moreover, in the Gallican Office it appears that during the singing of the offertory antiphon "oblatio fit munerum," and then, according to Mabillon, "Tunc fiebat oblatio panis et vini ad Sacrificium" (*ibid.*, p. 315). See on the general subject, Martene, "De Antiquis Eccl. Ritibus," lib. i., c. iv., Art. vi., tom. i., c. 385-389, also Le Brun, "Explic. Literalis," tom. i., pp. 137-143, and

Scudamore's Art. "Oblations," in Smith's "Dict. of Christian Antiquities." As to the question, "Is the word *oblations* intended by the revision of 1662 to include the elements?" see the references in "Eucharistic Presence," p. 519. It is important to note that the word had a specific meaning as applied to money and other offerings distinct from alms for the poor. (See Hooker, "Ecc. Pol.," book v., ch. lxxiv., § 4; Works, vol. ii., pp. 437, 438, edit. Keble, and "Clerical Reminiscences," by Senex, as quoted in Fausset's "Guide to Common Prayer," p. 131, and Wren in Jacobson's "Fragmentary Illustrations," p. 76, and Dean Howson's "Alms and Oblations." See also Blakeney's "Common Prayer," pp. 127, 152, for Liturgical examples in which the *elements* are clearly excluded.) It must in fairness be allowed that the preponderance of evidence is decidedly on the side of the *negative*—the arguments for which are ably and forcibly stated by Mr. Marshall in his "Latin Prayer-Book of Charles II.," pp. 61-80—though the forcible argument from the *Marginal Rubric* (see Goode's "Rule of Faith," vol. ii., p. 376) is hardly in itself quite conclusive. Mr. Scudamore informs us ("Not. Euch.," p. 409, 2nd edit.) that in the occasional Forms of Prayer of June 20 and July 12, 1665; August 14 and October 10, 1666; May 17, 1672; February 4, 1674; April 10, 1678 (which are preserved in the chapter library at Canterbury), "no celebration is contemplated, and yet the words 'and *oblations*' appear in all, with the corresponding marginal rubric." This is very important to be noted, and seems fatal to the theory of any *exclusive* application to the elements; unless, indeed, it may possibly be set down to some culpable negligence in correction. At the same time, it may be a relief to many to know that some contemporary Divines of eminence would certainly, and without rebuke, have answered the question in the *affirmative*. Witness the later editions of Bishop Patrick's "Mensa Mystica," of which the first edition had been published in 1660: "We pray Him therefore, in our Communion Service, to accept our 'oblations'—meaning those of bread and wine—as well as our 'alms'" (Works, vol. i., p. 115, Oxford, 1858). Such an interpretation, therefore, need hardly be regarded as utterly unnatural or inadmissible. And none need be offended at the allowance of a very ancient and catholic, if not primitive, practice which has been approved or defended by such men as H. Bullinger, Peter Martyr and Richard Baxter. (See "Eucharistic Presence," p. 519.) Dean Goode has well said: "So far as concerns an oblation or sacrifice of the elements of this kind, in the Eucharist, it is, as the learned Pfaff has observed, a mere logomachy to contend about it" ("Rule of Faith," vol. ii., p. 575). The following very noteworthy words of Baxter may be specially commended to the consideration of those who may regard the insertion of the word "oblations" as indicating anything like a triumph of sacerdotalism in 1662:

now who is not thankful for the addition made to the prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church ?¹

But it was at no request of the Presbyterian divines that the words were added, "And we also bless Thy holy Name for all Thy servants departed this life in Thy faith and fear ; beseeching Thee to give us grace so to follow their good examples, that with them we may be partakers of Thy heavenly kingdom."

Possibly some of the Puritans might have objected to it. Possibly even some of the revisers in King Edward's reign might have judged it to be running somewhat counter to their extreme principle of caution.² But what is there in this com-

"There are two several sorts of oblations which may lawfully be made (and fitly) at the Communion. (1) The creatures of bread and wine should be offered or presented before God, as acknowledging Him to be the Creator and Giver of all, and to desire His acceptance and benediction of them for that holy use. (2) Our alms or charitable contribution may be then fitly offered to God, that He may first accept it, and so it may be communicated to the Church and poor" (*Christian Directory*, Part III., Quest. xcviij.; *Works*, vol. v., pp. 448, 449, London, 1830). This is the sense in which the word seems to have been used in the primitive Church before the commemorative oblation ("which came up afterwards in the third century") was recognised. It can hardly be otherwise understood in the Epistle of Clemens Romanus (see *Waterland*, "Ancient Names of the Holy Com.," chap. i.; *Works*, vol. iv., p. 477, Oxford, 1843. See also *Scudamore*, "Notitia Eucharistica," pp. 409, 410, 2nd edit.).

¹ As to the position of this prayer, though it differs from that in the Roman and Eastern Liturgies (which also herein differ from one another), it is the same as that in the Gallican and Mozarabic Liturgies, and probably as that in the ancient British Church (see S.P.C.K. "Commentary," p. 103; and *Burbidge*, "Liturgies and Offices," p. 221). It is worthy of being noted that "the most ancient liturgies have the greatest variety in the order of parts" (*Canon Dixon*, "History of Church of England," vol. iii., p. 405; see *Freeman's "Principles of Divine Service,"* vol. ii., part ii., pp. 400, 432; and *Hammond's "Liturgies,"* Introduction, p. xxxvii).

² For in this matter they had rejected the recommendation of *Bucer*, who, after arguing strongly against prayer for the dead as it stood in this

memoration of the departed that can give reasonable offence to any? "Some such prayer," it has been well said, "is contained in every ancient Liturgy, the present form being accurately worded so as to avoid giving any countenance to the mediæval doctrine that the faithful departed are in any place of penal or purgatorial fire or unrest" (Warren, in S.P.C.K. "Commentary." See also Burbidge, "Liturgeries and Offices," pp. 221-223, and Bishop of St. Andrews on Cheyne's "Appeal," pp. 26, 27, Edinburgh, 1858).

Other similar changes, not without their importance, and not without their value, might doubtless be enumerated.

That certain changes and additions were admitted tending to increased reverence and deeper solemnity in the celebration of those holy mysteries—this is that in which (I trust) all may well agree to rejoice together.

But it is unquestionable that in the final revision Laudian influences were kept in check. It was doubtless not without cause that the Parliament appeared to be somewhat suspicious of certain tendencies among the clergy (see "Documents relating to Act of Uniformity," London, 1862; "Proceed-

place in Edward's first book, had desired that in its place should be substituted some such addition as that which was made in 1662. See his "Censura" in "Scripta Anglicana," p. 468: "His itaque de causis optarim ego commendationem defunctorum et precem pro æterna eorum pace, prætermitti: et in locum hujus commendationis et precationis preci præcedenti, quâ oratur concedi nobis exempla Divorum eorumque in fide constantiam, atque præceptorum Dei observantiam sequi, ista subjici, Quomodo unâ cum his, et omnibus qui ad te nos hinc in fide nominis tui præcesserunt, possimus in adventu filii tui gloriose prodire ad resurrectionem vitæ," etc.

Bishop Wren, after noting the omission, and the reason for it—"that the vulgar might not think they did either pray to the dead or for the dead"—added, "Thanks be to God! there can be no pretence at all now why it should not be restored" (Jacobson's "Fragmentary Illustrations," p. 77). See Palmer's "Origines Lit.," vol. ii., pp. 94-97.

ings in Parliament," pp. 426, 427), but it is certain that those tendencies, so far as they may have aimed at any conspicuous or important results, did not prevail (see Cardwell's "Conferences," pp. 378, 389-392). And I believe that the general result of the revision is not unfairly expressed (though perhaps the picture may be taken from a somewhat one-sided point of view) in Bishop White Kennett's "Register and Chronicle" as follows :

"Though this debate at the Savoy was ended without any great satisfaction to either party, yet both parties knew the desires and understood the abilities of the other much better than before it; and the late distressed clergy, that were now restored to their former rights and power, were so charitable as at their next meeting of Convocation to contrive to give the dissenting party satisfaction by alteration, explanation, and addition to some part, both of the *Rubric* and Common Prayer, as also by adding some new necessary collects, with a particular collect of thanksgiving" (pp. 632, 633; see also Walton, "Life of Sanderson," in Sanderson's "Sermons," p. 42, edit. 1686).¹

¹ It is true that the revision did not show signs of being much influenced by the proceedings at the Savoy. But the statement of Bishop Kennett must be allowed to qualify such assertions as the following: "Anyone may see that the objections raised at the Savoy Conference had not the smallest influence over the alterations that were made. In every case they were made in exactly the opposite direction. They were all in the Catholic, and not in the Protestant direction" (Pocock's "Recovery from the Principles of the Reformation," p. 38). Such assertions are not unfrequently made, and are capable of conveying serious misapprehensions. In fact, of the changes which were desired by the Presbyterians at the Savoy, some of the most considerable, which the Bishops *there* showed every disposition to resist, were conceded in the Prayer-Book as revised. Among the most important of these were: (1) The restoration of the black rubric; (2), the addition of the general thanksgiving; (3), the omission of "the waters of Jordan"; (4), alteration of rubric concerning singing the lessons.

It would obviously be out of place here to enter upon anything like a critical examination of the many minor alterations.¹ If very much has been made of them in recent years,

On this subject the reader may be glad to be referred to Mr. Parker's "Introduction to Revisions," p. cccxi.

See also my "Questions concerning the North Side Rubric," part ii., p. 3.

¹ Passing over the long list of more minute changes (as they seem to me) in the Communion Service, which Mr. Walton has with great care and diligence collected in p. 67 of his "Rubrical Determination," which indicate the carefulness of the revision and its concern for reverence in the administration, but which can hardly by any be supposed to have any considerable doctrinal import, I will set down here the list of changes which he gives in p. 22 as "undoubtedly derived, through the Scotch Liturgy, from Bishop Andrewes' Notes."

- (1) "The priest to recite the Commandments, *turning to the people*.
- (2) "The people to *stand* during the Gospel, and to be *still standing* at the Creed.
- (3) "The *deacons* to *receive* (not 'gather' as in the previous rubric) the alms.
- (4) "The alms to be brought to the priest, and by him to be humbly presented and placed upon the holy table.
- (5) "The solemn oblation of the elements (brought 'from a by-standing table.'—Andrewes).
- (6) "After the Confession, inserting the word 'absolution' in the following rubric . . . '*pronounce this Absolution.*'
- (7) "Insertion of the term 'prayer of consecration.'
- (8) "Revival of the ancient Catholic names 'paten' and 'chalice.'
- (9) "The priest while consecrating to break the bread, and take the chalice into his hand, 'Ejus ductu et exemplo Qui hic presidet.'
- (10) "After consecration, 'Amen' to be said."

Upon comparison of these with Bishop Andrewes' Notes, it is to be observed (a) that what may fairly be called the high ceremonialism recommended in those Notes is not to be found in the revised Liturgy; (b) that the "Amen" (No. 10) is, according to Andrewes, to be said by the communicant after the first half of the form of administration of the cup, not "after consecration."

Bishop Wren would have the communicant say "Amen" at the end of the words of delivery. He says: "The Church of Rome, to gain some colour to their fancy of transubstantiation, next after the words, 'The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ,' put in *Amen* there. Now, though we

approve not of that, yet there is no reason why it should be quite omitted" (Jacobson, "Fragmentary Illustrations," p. 82).

(c) That the change from "said" to "sung or said" before the Nicene Creed—so also in Preface (to which importance has been attached as making provision for choral celebrations; see Walton, "Rubrical Determination," p. 67)—is in distinct contravention of Bishop Andrewes' note in p. 152: "In sacra synaxi nihil canitur, quod alias fieri solet; sed omnia graviter et severe peraguntur cum affectu potius quam modulatione."

(d) That the revision has disregarded Andrewes' note concerning the Gospel: "In the reading the holy Gospel, and never else, is adoration made at the Name of Jesus" (p. 152), which is hardly to be reconciled with Canon XVIII. (except as that canon was interpreted by prevalent custom).

(e) That whereas in Andrewes' Notes, "These [the wafer, bread, and wine] the Bishop offers in the name of the whole congregation," and again, "Then he offers into the basin for himself, and after him the whole congregation" (p. 153), the revision designedly refused the word *offer*, doubtless lest the expression (however innocent and right in itself) might give needless offence to some.

(f) That whereas in Andrewes' note the offering is made "upon the altar" (p. 153), the revision nowhere restores the word "altar," which had been rejected in the revision of 1552.

Further, it should be observed, as regards No. 5, that what is called "the solemn oblation of the elements," is just what is directed in the Liturgy of Baxter: "Here let the bread be brought to the minister, and received by him, and set upon the table" (Hall's "Reliquiae Lit.," vol. iv., p. 68); whereas the revisers, following otherwise the form of the Scottish Liturgy of 1637, omit the words "offer up." The omission was a distinct rejection, for the words "offer up" were in the rubric as proposed in Sancroft's book (see Cardwell's "Conferences," p. 382). It must, therefore, have been with design, and with design which gives to the change just a contrary tendency to that which Mr. Walton would give it. Note also that in Baxter's Liturgy "the brethren" expunged a few lines "where the word *offering* was used" (see "Reliquiae Baxterianæ," p. 334; see also Harrison on Rubrics, p. 353). Note also that there is no verbal oblation of the elements (when placed) in the Liturgy of the Apostolical Constitutions; nor was there originally in the Roman Liturgy (see Scudamore's "Notitia Euch.," pp. 416, 417, 2nd edit.). Yet in mediæval missals the "solemn sacrifice" is the oblation of the bread and wine. And a special solemnity was associated with this rite until an increasing prominence, doctrinal and ceremonial, was given to the subsequent blessing and consecration of the gifts (see Simmons' "Lay Folks' Mass-Book," pp. 231, 234, 238, 268).

According to Bishop Wren's suggestion, the bread and wine were not to be "upon the Lord's board" till just before the prayer of humble access (see Jacobson's "Fragmentary Illustrations," p. 80).

And, as regards No. 9, the rubric does but direct to be done what the Presbyterian divines had desired at the Savoy. Among these "exceptions" we find the following: "We conceive that the manner of the consecrating of the elements is not here explicit and distinct enough, and the minister's breaking of the bread is not so much as mentioned."

It should, however, by no means be assumed (as too commonly it has been assumed) as unquestionable that in primitive times there was any *symbolical* fraction as distinct from the "breaking" for distribution (see Scudamore, "Notitia Euch.," pp. 606-613, especially p. 610, 2nd edit., and Brightman's "Liturgies," p. 581. But see also Nicholls on Common Prayer, note on "Break the bread," and Warren, "Celtic Ritual," p. 109).

The usual fraction was after consecration (see Benedict XIV., "De Sacrif. Missæ," sect. I, chap. cclv., Op., tom. ii., p. 97; also Badger, "Nestorians and their Ritual," vol. ii., pp. 235, 241). But this symbolical fraction is of uncertain origin and date (see Burbidge, "Liturgies and Offices," p. 232).

The fraction in the Consecration Prayer, as directed in the rubric of 1662, was no return to the use either of 1549 or of the Sarum Rite (see Church Press Co.'s edition, pp. 311, 314, and Maskell, "Anc. Lit.," p. 50). And the fraction *at this point* appears to be without precedent in any Eastern Liturgy (except in the rites of the Coptic and Abyssinian Jacobites; see Brightman's "Liturgies," pp. 177, 232), though in the Ambrosian Liturgy (and in that of the ancient Celtic Church) it *immediately follows* the prayer of consecration.

But a strong insistence on the manual acts (*including the fraction*) *at the consecration* may be said to be characteristic of the teaching of English Puritanism (see evidence of this in Davis' "Practical Defence," Seeley, p. 13).

So that it might not unfairly be argued that the new rubric indicated a change in a Puritan, rather than in a (so-called) "Catholic" direction.

So also it may be observed (though scarcely worth notice), as regards No. 7, that the Presbyterian divines had named that prayer "the prayer at the consecration" (Cardwell, p. 321).

As regards No. 4, it may perhaps be worth noting that the exception given in by the Presbyterians to the former rubric—"Then shall the churchwardens, or some other by them appointed, gather the devotion of the people"—"collection for the poor may be better made at or a little before the departing of the communicants"—would seem to be recommending an entire abolition of the offertory; whereas Bucer has highly

it is very much more than was made of them at the time, and very much more, as I am persuaded, than will endure the flame of the critical furnace.

It has, indeed, been urged by some that, trifling as they may seem, these minute changes were as little seeds,¹ which were sown as in secret silence *then*, that in after generations we might gather in the ripe and goodly fruit of a sacrificial *sacerdotium* and something like a restored missal-service.

commended it ("Scripta Anglicana," p. 463), and Bullinger had described the ancient custom: "Stabant diaconi oblata a populo accipientes, quæ presbyter demum offerebat Domino, cum precatione et gratiarum actione super oblatis rebus habita, quæ accepta esse cupiebat per Dominum Jesum" ("De Origine Erroris," cap. vii., p. 213; Tiguri, 1539). See Harrison on "Rubrics," pp. 340-347; Le Brun, "Explicatio Lit.," tom. i., pp. 137-141; Cardwell's "Conferences," p. 273; also Scudamore's "Notitia Euch.," pp. 343-353, 2nd edit.

I can hardly suppose that the reader will think any observations needful on the other particulars.

¹ Mr. Alexander Knox says: "What, then, can we suppose, but that those changes were meant by Providence to subserve ulterior movements; to lie dormant, as it were, until nearer 'the time of the end,' when it might suit the order of Providence that what was before deposited as seed, should grow up into a rich and luxuriant harvest" ("Remains," vol. i., p. 60, 2nd edit.). Mr. Walton, who quotes these words, regards them as "prophetic words," "written in 1816" ("Rubrical Determination," p. 26, new edit.).

A little before Knox had said: "The revisers seized the opportunity (contrary to what the public was reckoning upon) to make our formulæries not more Puritanic, but more Catholic. They effected this, without doubt, *stealthily*, and, to appearance, by the minutest alteration; but to compare the Communion Service as it now stands, especially its rubrics, with the form in which we find it previously to that transaction, will be to discover that, *without any change of features which could cause alarm*, a new spirit was then breathed into our Communion Service" (pp. 59, 60). But these words are not quoted by Mr. Walton.

If I understand Mr. Knox aright (from whom I grieve to differ), he appears to attribute to the revisers a *deep and dark design*, which I should be sorry to think they were capable of, and which, I feel sure, was far from their intentions.

But I find no evidence of the revisers themselves having had any thought at all of regarding themselves as sowers of such prolific seeds. Indeed, it seems acknowledged that this sowing was generally unobserved¹ in their day. And very sure I am that they would never have put their hand to any such seed-sowing if they had had any idea of these seeds ripening into a harvest of what is now too often regarded as "Catholic doctrine."

Without committing ourselves to the assertion that nothing might have been done better, or that nothing² more might have been attempted in the way of conciliation—nothing more to manifest a loving desire to cross the bridge of separation and to embrace offended and offending brethren in the unity of the spirit and the bond of peace—we may still look on our Service for the administration of the Holy Communion, and thank God for the last review, both for what it did do and for what it did not do.

The impress and character of "Reformed" Theology is still to be seen stamped on our Liturgy as sharp and clear as when it came from the "Reformed" mint in 1552. It may be regarded as something very remarkable, if not very

¹ Thus Mr. Alexander Knox writes: "Who can doubt of this transaction being, in all its bearings, providential? And yet it was clearly insufficient to produce any extended or striking effect. It has actually *escaped general observation*. Wheatley on the Liturgy notices the changes; but, though himself a High Churchman, overlooks their import. Nicholls, if I remember right, scarcely advert's to the fact; and Shepherd, who meant to take pains, seems not to have known anything of the matter" ("Remains," vol. i., p. 60).

Mr. Knox might have added the names of others who failed to see the import of these little changes.

² Archbishop Tenison says: "If they had foreseen what is since come to pass, I charitably believe they would not have done all they did, and just so much, and no more" ("Compl. History," p. 252; see Neal's "History of Puritans," vol. iii., p. 97).

wonderful, that, coming out of a fire heated with a strong anti-Puritan flame,¹ its doctrinal markings have been so little touched, and injured not at all.² Not a mark nor a

¹ Not that the clergy as a whole had much sympathy with Laudian views. Neal himself says: "The country clergy were of a quite different spirit: they were determined Protestants and true Churchmen, but more disposed to a coalition with Protestant Dissenters than with Papists" ("History of Puritans," vol. iii., p. 130; London, 1837).

The London clergy, it appears, had even elected Baxter and Calamy as their proctors in convocation (see Blakeney on "Common Prayer," p. 135, 3rd edit.).

The anti-Puritan feeling was manifested chiefly in the House of Commons. Clarendon says of the Bill: "Every man, according to his passion, thought of adding somewhat to it that might make it more grievous to somebody whom he did not love." The Lords had pleaded the King's declaration in favour of *tender consciences*. The Commons replied "that his Majesty could not understand the *misleaders* of the people, but only the *misled*." (See Lister's "Life of Clarendon," vol. ii., pp. 185, 186.)

² Dean Luckock brings "a long and heavy bill of indictment against the second revisionists [*i.e.*, those who were responsible for Edward VI.'s second book] for departure from Catholic doctrine" ("Studies," p. 106). He even goes so far as to say: "It seems difficult to acquit them of hypocrisy or infatuation" (p. 108). But he regards their designs as "so far hopelessly baffled, that at the final revision the Church was able solemnly to declare that the true Eucharistic doctrine had remained essentially unchanged from the first revision to the last" (p. 109). He appeals to the language of the Preface of 1662: "We find, that in the reigns of several princes of blessed memory since the Reformation, the Church, upon just and weighty considerations her thereunto moving, hath yielded to make such alterations in some particulars, as in their respective times were thought convenient; yet so, as that the main body and essentials of it, as well in the chiefest materials as in the frame and order thereof, have still continued the same unto this day, and do yet stand firm and unshaken." He considers it "impossible to exaggerate the weight of this declaration" (p. 110).

But obviously the argument from these words may lead to two very different conclusions, according to the sense we attribute to "the main body and essentials" of the Liturgy.

Are we to suppose that these terms must mean that doctrine of the Presence and the Sacrifice which "mistakers" may have read into the

scratch is on it from Lutheranizing or Romanizing influence. Not a trace is to be found on it of the erroneous sacrificial

first book? And are we to conclude that the revisers meant us to understand that these same doctrines are now to be read into the second book which so carefully excluded them? If so, why did the revision of 1662 decline to undo "the departure from Catholic doctrine" which was due to the "hypocrisy or infatuation" of our Reformers? And why did they in the Preface express such approval of the book "as it stood before established by law"?

But let "the main body and essentials" be understood as pointing, among other things, to "that which," in the language of Hooker ("Ecc. Pol.", v., chap. lxvii., § 12), "alone is material" (in the doctrine of the Eucharist), and all is easy, intelligible and consistent. Then we see and recognise the unchanged character of our "Reformed" Prayer-Book, and acknowledge that its essentials "have still continued the same unto this day, and do yet stand firm and unshaken"; whereas, on Dean Luckock's hypothesis, much Catholic truth had been shaken, and quite shaken out, and the revisers of 1662 (not restoring the liberty of reserving the Blessed Sacrament) have left parish priests (in cases of wide-spread sickness) with no alternative but to "transgress the existing law, or leave men to die without the food of eternal life" (p. 88). They have also, in Dean Luckock's view, "left a most lamentable blot on the book" (p. 89), in disowning prayers for the dead; and further, in not ordering the Holy Eucharist at burials, have "left a void in our Prayer-Book for which nothing but its full restoration can ever supply adequate consolation" (pp. 90, 91); and in continuing the displacement of the prayer of oblation, they have sanctioned "a direct breach of Catholic usage" (p. 102).

If I mistake not, the words on which Dean Luckock relies will be found to signify, in their natural and obvious interpretation, that the revisers did not change, and had no thought or desire of changing, the doctrinal character of our distinctly "Reformed" "Prayer-Book"—regarding the doctrine of the book as it was before their revision (*i.e.*, in the main the book which, in Dean Luckock's view, manifests a "departure from Catholic doctrine") as retaining "the main body and essentials" of the Liturgy yet "standing firm and unshaken."

"Indeed, the *ipsissima verba* which form the basis of Dean Luckock's argument will be found in the language of Gauden, then Bishop Elect of Exeter, who, writing in 1661, thus expressed himself: "My judgment is that the Liturgy of the Church of England, as to the *main and essentials* of it, in doctrine, devotion, consecration and celebration, for matter, order and method, may in no case be maimed, rudely changed, or oddly de-

doctrine of which it was so carefully divested in King Edward's reign.¹ It is, as the Act of Uniformity declares, the Book of Elizabeth (which was the Second Book of Edward) with certain additions and alterations, some of the most important of which (including even some of those now regarded as "Catholic" changes) were made at the instance of the formed" ("Considerations Touching the Liturgy," p. 23; London, 1661). And this he wrote in the persuasion that the Liturgy would preserve in England "the reformed part of religion," to be a "most impregnable bulwark against . . . Romish superstitions," and "for ever keep out the Mass" (*ibid.*, p. 12).

And it may be worth noting that, as regards the "displacement" of the "prayer of oblation," neither did Bishop Sanderson, who penned the Preface in draft, nor did Bishop Wren, at whose house the Episcopal Committee met, seem to have had any desire to correct what, in Dean Luckock's view, is such "a direct breach of Catholic usage" (see Jacobson's "Fragmentary Illustrations," pp. 27, 28, 83).

And we know that the Bishops at Ely House declined to sanction such a change.

Where, then, is the evidence that the last review effected any such important change in the doctrine of our Liturgy?

Lord Selborne says, "The tabular list or conspectus, prefixed to the 'Convocation Book,' and bound up in it when sent to the House of Lords, shows all the alterations and additions, then thought material, which had been made by Convocation at the time when it was drawn up: and it would require a theological microscope of high magnifying power to find in these (of which some were afterwards withdrawn) any substantial change of the doctrinal balance of the former Liturgy" ("Notes on Liturgical History," pp. 48, 49).

Such a statement from such an authority carries a weight which cannot easily be set on one side.

It is surely impossible to believe that, by "the main body and essentials" of the Liturgy, the Preface means us to understand those very doctrines which were with scrupulous care eliminated at the Reformation, and have never been restored.

¹ The change in the second exhortation from "in remembrance of His death" to "in remembrance of the sacrifice of His death" (see Walton's "Rubrical Determination," p. 67), should rather, as I think, tell *against* than *for* any such doctrine. (See "Eucharistic Presence," pp. 493, 531, and Scudamore's "Notitia Euch.," pp. 473, 474, 2nd edit.).

Presbyterian Divines, or in accordance with their views, and all of which were desirable or unobjectionable from the point of view of the Churchmanship of the Reformed Church of England.¹

I will only add that if any one of my readers has cherished the idea of a deep recondite "Catholic" sense underlying the numerous minor changes effected at the last review, he has but to read with careful attention what is said in the Preface (the work of Bishop Sanderson),² which is itself an integral part of the Prayer-Book,³ to see that such a notion is utterly repugnant to the declared design of the revisers⁴ themselves, and to the professed assurance of the very Prayer-Book itself.

The revision has done its work, and in the main we may surely say the substance of our Communion Book is unaltered.⁵

¹ See Blakeney's "Book of Common Prayer," p. 144, 2nd edit.

² Dr. White Kennett tells us: "It may be noted that, for the satisfying all the dissenting brethren and others, the Convocation's reasons for the alterations and additions to the Liturgy were by them desired to be drawn up by Dr. Sanderson, which being done by him and approved by them, was appointed to be printed before the Liturgy, and may be now known by this title 'The Preface,' and begins thus: 'It hath been the wisdom of the Church,' " etc. ("Register and Chronicle," p. 633).

³ "Mistakers" may also be recommended to read the Act of Uniformity for further evidence of the character and purpose of the Revision.

⁴ In the list of "Alterations" appended to the copy of the book of 1636 which was prepared by the revisers for the copyist, there are specified ten changes in "Communion," none of which can fairly be regarded as innovations in doctrine. At the foot of the entire list we find the words, "These are all the material alterations. The rest are only verbal, or the changing of some rubrics for the better performing of the service, or the new moulding of some of the Collects."

⁵ The rubric for second consecration of either bread or wine (following a somewhat similar direction in the Scottish Liturgy of 1637) has no precedent either in 1549 or 1552. It does not appear to have been a concession to any expressed desire of the Puritan party. It was but providing

Still we look in vain for the restoration of such expressions as before 1552 looked most like a corporal Presence. Still we look in vain for any Invocation of the Holy Spirit on the Elements.¹ Still we look in vain to find in the Consecration Prayer any asking for any such inherent change in God's creatures as the objective theory² requires. Still we look in vain for any such sacrificial language as the maintainers of that theory desire. Still we look in vain for any such adoration as we are told the "real objective Presence" demands.

Some concluding observations must be reserved for another chapter.

for obedience to the twenty-first canon, which enjoins that "no bread or wine newly bought shall be used; but first the words of institution shall be rehearsed, when the said bread and wine be present upon the Communion-table." But it indicates anything but a (so-called) "Catholic" intention. See Pope Benedict XIV., "De Sacrificio Missæ," who has a chapter (sect. 2, chap. lxxxii., p. 157; Patavii, 1745), the heading of which is as follows: "Consecratio utriusque speciei est de jure Divino: Si quis alterutram, sine altera consecret, peccat grayissime, et conficit quidem Sacramentum, sed non sacrificium." In this chapter Thomas Aquinas is quoted as saying: "Nec propter defectum alterius est unum tantum sine altero consecrandum, quia non esset perfectum sacramentum" (p. 198). What Pope Benedict and Aquinas had in view was doubtless a consecration in a separate service, but their words can hardly be otherwise understood than as indirectly condemning the practice which our rubric enjoins.

Canon Estcourt ("Anglican Ordinations," p. 336) regards this rubric as reviving "the sacrilegious rubric of 1548, directing a second consecration in one kind if required."

¹ See "Eucharistic Presence," pp. 559-561, 553.

² It is significant that no room was found in the Consecration prayer for even the very modest addition (suggestive or admitting of a *μημόσυνον* sense) which appears in the MSS. proposals of Bishop Wren (see Jacobson's "Fragmentary Illustrations," p. 81).

CHAPTER V.

OBSERVATIONS.

I MUST proceed now—and I do so under a very deep and painful sense of responsibility—to submit for careful and deliberate consideration some observations on the subject which has been occupying our attention in this series of articles.

If the view which has been presented of the history of our Prayer-Book, and its relation to the controversies of former days, be substantially the true view, it must be obvious that the conclusions arrived at have a most important bearing on an approaching crisis—for a crisis of some sort is surely (humanly speaking) inevitable in the Church of England.

We have even yet fresh in our remembrance the claim made by a leading and influential religious journal—not professing to represent extreme opinions—a claim made on behalf of a lately deceased Cardinal, whose position since 1845 had been confessedly one of hostility (though we may gladly add of *kindly* hostility) to the Reformed Church of England, that he is rightly to be regarded as the “founder” (“we may almost say”) of that Church as we now see it.¹

“*De mortuo nil nisi bonum.*” We should be sorry to be severe (or to seem to wish to be severe) on the very remark-

¹ These words did not, indeed, pass unchallenged, and a correspondent of the *Guardian* claimed them as belonging “not to him (Newman), but to Dr. Pusey” (August 27, 1890).

But Dean Lake (whose letter appeared in the same issue) wrote: “Most fair-minded men will agree, I believe, with a statement of your

able echoes of eulogium which were heard resounding on every side in the week which followed the announcement of Cardinal Newman's death.

Moreover, we think it well that the minds of English Churchmen should be led to recognise—as they hardly yet have recognised—the new departure which dates from the influence of Newman and his associates in the University of Oxford. The language used by the *Guardian* we believe to be quite true in a sense reaching perhaps far beyond what the *Guardian* itself might be ready to allow.

own, that the Roman Church has not 'the same paramount reason to be grateful to him' as we have, for that he is the 'founder, we may almost say, of the Church of England, as we see it.' " The Dean adds, referring to the twelve years after the illness in Sicily: "It is to those twelve years that we owe the establishment of principles which have gone far to *change the character of the Church of England* during the last half-century, and of which the full development is probably still to come."

It may perhaps seem to some a remarkable illustration of the *changed character of the Church of England*, that this letter should have been written by one of her dignitaries concerning a Roman Cardinal who had deserted the Anglican Church, with her Scriptural doctrine and Apostolical order, to join a Church which regards us as heretics, and who, while with us, had been surely, however unconsciously, clearing the ground for the sowing the seed of "erroneous and strange doctrine"—doctrines of which, after his secession, he could see clearly and acknowledge honestly, that they were condemned by the Church of England as "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits." See, e.g., his words in "Via Media," vol. ii., p. 352 (Longmans, 1891): "What the Thirty-first Article *repudiates* is undeniably the central and most sacred doctrine of the Catholic religion, and so its wording has ever been read since it was drawn up."

We may gladly add, however, that what the Dean appears to have had in view was the character of devotion and self-sacrifice, which he believes we owe "to Newman even more than to his great fellow-workers."

And all will be ready to agree with the Dean that the Church of England does indeed owe a debt to all those (God be thanked that in the midst of much sad need of revival there have been, and there are, many such) who have set an example of true devotion and holy enthusiasm in the cause of Christ and the truth of His Gospel.

It *was* a new departure, a new founding—in some sense a building on a new foundation—a founding of something quite new, and quite different from the Church of the old historical Anglican party, which (in the persons of its best representatives) had so ably and consistently maintained the primitive Catholicity of the Church of England against Papal innovations and Puritan scrupulosities. It *was* a founding—or an attempt to found—a Church of England strangely unlike the Church which had been upheld by such men as Jewel and Hooker and Andrewes, altogether different from that which had been in the view of Laud and Bramhall, and Cosin and Bull.

But let us desire to acknowledge quite to the full what there was of good in the Oxford Movement.

We should very few of us probably desire to have restored to us exactly the state of things which existed before the Oriel Common-Room engaged in the task of changing the character of our English religion—a state of things not easy to be realized by those who do not belong to the generation of the past.

Probably a few—possibly not a few—of those who read these pages may have found little help to true devotion in what they regard as the painful artificialities and apparent unrealities too often characterizing the ornate ceremonial and musical intonations so pleasing to the present generation. But in their desire for a simpler and more natural service, they need not imagine that there was everything to encourage the worshipping of God in spirit and in truth when all external decencies were neglected or avoided.

It will perhaps be generally allowed that there is some measure of truth in the opinion that currents of religious thought which had swept over our land (though some of them most healthful in their tendencies) had left the Church of England not only with too low an estimate of the accessories

of worship, and a disposition to denounce as Popish every effort to support the dignity of "decency," and promote the due observance of order and the outward forms of reverence in the services of the sanctuary, but also with something like an ignorance of, if not with a certain prejudice against, the true Church principles of our Reformed Theology, and (speaking generally) with a somewhat inadequate view of the position of the Sacraments of the New Testament in relation to the Gospel of Christ.

If this was so, it was time that there should be something like a loyal rebellion against the reign of slovenliness, a practical crusade against the practice of irreverence, and a legal revolt against the law of disorder.

If this was so, it was surely well that there should be a return to the study of the true Scriptural theology of our Reforming divines, and a fearless defending (in its integrity) of the faith once for all delivered unto the saints.

And if this was so, it is well, it is right, that the need which existed for some correcting movement should now be fully and freely acknowledged.

And then it may also be willingly confessed that herein was that which, in some measure, must be held to account for and excuse the strange intermingling in the reactionary movement of those who desired to be true disciples of the English Reformation with those who were (perhaps unconsciously at first) engaged in the work of Romanizing the Church of England, while still condemning the corruptions of Rome. For some of them use an extreme bitterness of opprobrium and a vehemence of strong language such as in writings of Anglican theologians¹ will hardly (or rarely) be matched.

¹ Witness the terrible denunciation of the Romish Church written by Newman in 1837: "If we are induced to believe the professions of Rome

Let it not be thought that we are unwilling to recognise and acknowledge to the full all the good that is due to the very remarkable influence of the new movement among us.

But when we turn to the matter of Eucharistic doctrine, we can have no hesitation in preferring the Church of England as reformed by our Reformers, to the Church of England as founded by Cardinal Newman. And it is a matter of importance, surely, that we should see clearly the choice that is set before us. We can hardly be mistaken in declaring that a conflict is impending—a conflict in which everyone will be called to take a part—a conflict between the old and the new, between the Church of England as it was—the truest and the purest and most truly Catholic representative of the

and make advances towards her, as if a sister or a Mother Church, which in theory she is, we shall find too late that we are in the arms of a pitiless and unnatural relative, who will but triumph in the arts which have inveigled us within her reach. Let us be sure she is our enemy, and will do us a mischief where she can. . . . Crafty, obstinate, wilful, malicious, cruel, unnatural as madmen are—or, rather, she may be said to resemble a demoniac. Thus, she is her real self only in name; and till God vouchsafe to restore her, we must treat her as if she were that Evil One which governs her" (see "Romanism and Popular Protestantism," pp. 102, 103).

How strange that the writer of such a warning should so soon have been lured into the embrace of the unnatural relative, who did, indeed, triumph in the arts which inveigled him within her reach! How much stranger still if we are to understand that the use of any such language as this was afterwards (in part) excused or apologized for, or its guilt extenuated as being the echo of the opinions of others, or as a manifesto required by the necessities of the writer's position! (See "Apol. pro Vitâ Suâ," pp. 201-203.)

The quotation is taken directly from Dean Burgon's "Lives of Twelve Good Men." Dean Burgon says concerning it: "It was the deliberate result of all his (Newman's) study and observation, all his reading and reflection, on the subject of the Romish branch of the Church Catholic down to the time of his writing." He adds that it is no *obiter dictum*, "but a passage from a published volume on the very subject to which it relates; and the sight of it when he saw it in print in 1837 did not daunt its author, for he republished it in 1838" (p. 136, edit. 1891).

Reformation movement, and the Church of England as the admirers of Newman would fain make it. It would emerge an unhealthy branch of the unreformed Christian Church, almost as it emerged from the dark ages of ignorance, when the parasites of mediæval superstition and idolatry had struck their roots into her bark, and had *developed* into a religious system of faith and of practice assimilated indeed to the worship of the heathens, but having (in the superstructure which overlaid foundation truths) little in common with the doctrine which had been delivered by the Apostles—such as was assuredly another Gospel than that which had been preached by St. Paul, and was a forged addition to the faith once for all delivered to the saints.

Our Reformers would have laughed to scorn the idea that they were contending merely or mainly about such matters as the infallibility or supremacy of the Pope or the immaculate conception of the Virgin.

They laid down their lives, and, till the Church of England was refounded by Newman and others, they were honoured as martyrs¹—honoured alike by High Churchmen and Low Churchmen, honoured by the true sons of the old Church of England—honoured for laying down their lives as witnesses against the teachings—the blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits—which are inseparable from the Romish doctrine of the Mass² as now formulated and fixed

¹ See "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," No. vii., p. 512.

² See "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," pp. 541, 542. That Bishop Tunstall (see Collier's "Eccles. Hist.," vol. iv., p. 422, edit. 1840; and letter of G. H. R. H. in *Guardian* of September 10, 1890) recognised "Heterodoxies" (the expression "impious doctrine" is rather the reflection of the opinions of those he is opposing) in certain scholastic teachings concerning the Mass, and that other upholders of the Romish doctrine have sometimes used strong language against popular conceptions or abuses of Romish teaching, cannot alter the fact that the language of our

and stereotyped in the decrees of the Council of Trent, and summarized in the Creed of Pope Pius IV.

Article XXXI. is directed against that which now is the accredited doctrine of Rome.

Tunstall (long on more than friendly terms with Cranmer, and probably his assistant in his scheme for reforming the Breviary—see Gasquet's “*Edward VI.*,” pp. 28, 29) was one of those men who, while they could never accept what they regarded as the dangerous innovations of the Reformation, were not blind to the light in which the Reformers were walking. And we need not doubt that if he, and such as he (their acceptance of transubstantiation notwithstanding), could have influenced the proceedings of the Council of Trent, some of the mediæval superstitions of the Mass doctrine might have been condemned, instead of being made into component parts of the Romish faith. But in that assembly the overpowering influence of the Italian and Spanish prelates (many of them creatures of the Pope and tools of the Jesuits) forged new fetters for the adherents of the Papacy, and made decrees which virtually condemned, not only the doctrines of the Reformed and the Articles of the Church of England, but with these the teachings of such men as Sadoleto, and Contarini, and Ægidius of Viterbo, and Seripandi, and Cajetan (may we not add the names of Tunstall and Pole?)—men who had in measure been making their light to shine in Romish darkness. Witness the following from Cajetan (teaching a doctrine which is only more fully expanded in our Article XXXI.): “*Ex eo quod in lege nova facta est remissio peccatorum per oblationem Christi jam nulla superest oblatio pro peccato. Fieret enim injuria oblationi Christi, tanquam minus sufficienti*” (“*Epistolæ Pauli . . . juxta sensum literalem enarratæ*,” fol. 201, *a* Parisiis, 1540). Compare with this the words of Chrysostom: *Εἰ τοίνυν ἀφῆκε τὰς ἀμαρτίας διὰ τῆς μᾶς θυσίας, οὐκέτι χρέα δευτέρας* (“*In Ep. ad Heb.*,” cap. x., hom. xviii.; *Op.*, tom. xii., p. 175, Ed. Montfaucon, Paris, 1735; see also p. 134). Cajetan adds: “*Nec propterea novicie mireris quotidie offerri sacrificium altaris in Christi ecclesia, quoniam non est novum sacrificium, sed illudmet quod Christus obtulit commemoratur: præcipiente ipso, hoc facite in mei commemorationem*,” which, again, is almost an echo of the explanation of Chrysostom, pp. 168, 169. And contrast with this the language of Bellarmine: “*Remissio perfecta nondum facta est, sed quotidie fit, et fiet usque ad mundi consummationem; ergo manet adhuc, et manebit usque ad mundi consummationem hostia pro peccato*” (“*De Missa*,” lib. ii., cap. ii., c. 1047). These words, of course, refer to “application” (see c. 1030). Still, no explanation of them can ever bring them into harmony with Heb. x. 18. But for

It is idle, we fear, to doubt (let it be said with no bitterness of spirit, but in sadness of sorrow) that we have now

a fuller examination of this teaching see "Romish Mass and English Church," pp. 41-44 (see also "Dangerous Deceits," p. 9).

Canon Jenkins has well said: "It can never be too confidently affirmed that the doctrines laid down at Trent did not represent the faith of the Western Church, as it was explained by its most authoritative expositors but a few years before its assembly" ("Pre-Tridentine Doctrine," p. 6; see also pp. 99-101, 112-114).

See also Dean Field, "Of the Church," Bk. III., App. 72-94 (E. H. S.), where will be found evidence of his assertion (p. 94): "It is made clear and evident that the best and worthiest amongst the guides of God's Church, before Luther's time, taught as we do, that the sacrifice of the altar is only the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and a mere representation and commemoration of the sacrifice once offered on the cross, and consequently are all put under the curse, and anathematized by the Tridentine Council" (see also pp. 65 and 72).

A brief summary of testimonies to the same truth may be seen in Birckbek's "Protestant Evidence," Cent. XVI., pp. 156-158; London, 1635).

But see especially Chemnitz's "Examen Conc. Trid.," Pars II., Loc. VI., De Missa, Art. IV., pp. 385-387, and Art. VIII., pp. 399-403 (Berolini, 1861).

It is not of course intended to imply that Cajetan did not maintain the sacrifice of the Mass, but that his doctrine of the Mass-sacrifice will hardly accord, if we understand him aright, with the doctrine of Trent (see Canon Jenkins' "Pre-Tridentine Doctrine," p. 100).

Neither is it intended to question that the Church of Rome holds and teaches the doctrine of atonement by the one sacrifice of the cross. The question is not at all about this doctrine, but whether the Tridentine doctrine of the Mass is consistent with it (see "Dangerous Deceits," pp. 12 *sqq.*, and especially "Missarum Sacrificia," pp. 232-236).

The reader may be asked to weigh well the following words, quoted from the *Church Quarterly Review* of April, 1896: "It can hardly be denied, especially in the light of what has become 'l'enseignement traditionnel' since Trent, that the Protestants have so far made out their case as to show that the priest's offering of Christ in the Mass, as it is destructive, so it is necessarily reiterative; and therefore the doctrine that the Mass is a 'verum ac propitiatorium sacrificium' is one that must come into collision with the Epistle to the Hebrews in the end" (p. 47).

This is a very important testimony, as coming from a writer who seems desirous of taking the most favourable view of Romish doctrine, but is too

to do with an aggressive party in the Church which would desire to undo the work of the Reformation as our Reformers effected it, and would desire to frame a National Church much more according to the plans of Cardinal Newman than after the counsels of Archbishop Cranmer.

Hence the desire to rid the Church of England of the thirty-nine Articles altogether, or, failing that, to rid the Articles themselves of the doctrine of the "Reformed," and so to muffle their voice that they may give forth only a so-called "Catholic" sound.

Hence also the desire to have restored to us the use of the mediæval missal of Sarum, or, failing that, the permissive use (in whole or in part) of the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI.

fair to limit the application of our Article XXXI. to the system of private Masses, and such abuses of the Mass doctrine as were sometimes attributed (in error) to Thomas Aquinas and Catharinus. He says: "Judged by its history, that the aim of Article XXXI. was primarily directed against the system of private Masses we cannot doubt; but, on the other hand, that its denunciation is even more comprehensive, and *touched the doctrine of the Mass itself*, we are ready to believe. There was a close connection between the doctrine of the Mass and the system of private Masses. It was felt at the time. To Lutheran protests against private Masses, it was replied: 'Hoc de omni Missâ asserunt, non de privata duntaxat.' And at Trent the doctrine of the Mass was so drawn up as to cover with its ægis the ideas on which that system rested" (p. 45). See "Dangerous Deceits," pp. 16-20.

There were those who in the time of the Reformation would fain have made it appear that the Protestants aimed only at the abolition of "the privie masses, because they have occasion of sundry abuses; because there is an open fair or market made of celebration of Masses." Such was the statement of the forged document circulated in England (probably also in France and Germany), as the joint production of Luther and Melanchthon, by which even Strype was misled. Seckendorf's reply reads thus: "Neque solum nundinationes Missarum improbabant, sed etiam, quod pro sacrificio propitiatorio haberentur. Ideo Missam ad solam Communionem sacram revocarunt" ("Commentarius Hist. et Apol.", lib. iii., sect. 19, § lxxiii., p. 228, Lipsiæ, 1694. See also Dr. Jacobs' "Lutheran Movement in England," pp. 159, 160, 163).

And there are not wanting indications that the advanced Anti-Reformed Party may choose for their first battle-field the question of returning to the use of the service of "the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass," of 1549.

If so—can we, any of us, doubt that on this battle-field they must be met?¹ And can we question that they should be met, not by men alone of one party or school of thought, but by all who would be true and faithful to the "Reformed" and genuine Catholic doctrine of the Church of our fathers?

And let us not fail to mark that the battle-field chosen by the extreme party of advance is well chosen. It is well chosen, for in support of their claim to be allowed the use of the first book of Edward, they can put forth pleas which at first sight seem very plausible, and which to those who take no account of the dangerous tendencies in the air may even well appear to be very reasonable.

1. They can fairly plead that the very Act of Uniformity

¹ Nothing said here or in previous chapters must be understood as implying that the Church of England would exclude any from lay-communion on account of their holding doctrines of the Eucharistic Presence or Sacrifice which she does not hold. And as regards the Lutheran doctrine, it should always be remembered that its Lutheran setting makes it comparatively innocuous. On this point see "Eucharistic Presence," pp. 173, 174. What *we* are now called upon to deal with is something very different. But the obvious purpose of giving a distinctly "Reformed" character to our English Service does not, of course, imply a design of making it repellent to those of different views (see "The Answer of the Bishops at the Savoy," Prop. I., § 5, in Cardwell's "Conferences," p. 138). The Church's faith has to do with that which "alone is material," *i.e.*, "the Real Presence," to the faith of our souls. All else has to do with that which (in the "Reformed" view alone) is only the *mode*; and the negation of a *mode*, as a *mode* (even though seriously erroneous, and in its results pernicious), is no article of the Christian faith. On this subject see "The Theology of Bishop Andrewes," p. 12, note, and pp. 14-17; also Grindal's Remains, pp. 250, 251, P.S. edit.; and Hammond's Works, vol. i., p. 386. London, 1684.

which established the use of the second book defended (and more than defended) the use of the first.

2. They can plead that there have been saintly and learned divines of the Reformed Church of England who have not hesitated on liturgical grounds to express a preference, in some respects, for the first, and a regret that so many changes had been made in the second.

3. They can urge that daughter Churches, in communion with the Reformed Church of England, have used their liberty in the way of alterations in the office of the Holy Communion tending rather towards approximation to the service of the first book.

4. They can urge also that increasing study of, and improved acquaintance with, the ancient liturgies of the Christian Church have tended rather to make men look more favourably than before on the form and order of the first book.¹

¹ It must, however, by no means be assumed as certain that, of the mass of liturgical apparatus on which learned scholars have lately been expending their labours, all that is most important and valuable is new light, which was inaccessible to the study of our Reformers. See Mr. Burbidge's "Liturgies and Offices," chaps. v., vi. Those who may feel disposed to regard the (so-called) Apostolic Liturgies as authentic documents, and as "writings which must ever rank in theological value next to the Holy Scriptures themselves," may be advised to read Mr. Malan's preface to his "Original Documents of the Coptic Church," as well as his introduction to "The Divine Liturgy of the Armenian Church." See also Cassander, "Liturgica," cap. ii., Op., pp. 11, 12 (Paris, 1616); and Walafrid Strabo, "De rebus Eccles.," cap. 22, in Hittorpius, p. 345, for evidence of the primitive simplicity of the Eucharistic Rite, the service being not less holy or acceptable on that account than after it had received its numerous additions (in the West) from the "Scholasticus" and various Popes (see Hittorpius, p. 385, and Cassander, Op., pp. 127, 128).

Rupertus Tuitiensis says: "Studiosa divinæ legis Ecclesia Romana paulatim protulit de thesauro suo nova pietatis monumenta, et quoddam velut ex auro lapidibusque pretiosis religiosi officii sancto sacrificio fabrefecit diadema. Non quidem sanctius hinc est, quam erat prius quando

And, now, what answer, it will be asked, have we to these pleas? How are we to meet our opponents, if we have to meet them, on this battle-field of controversy?

It will be found that to give a true and satisfactory answer to the first plea will involve a sufficient reply to all the other pleas. And, accordingly, the chief aim and object of this series of papers has been to lead up to the one true and conclusive answer to the first of these very plausible arguments.

It is impossible, indeed, for us not to foresee that it will seem to many to be a very strange way of strengthening our position as against those who are earnestly desiring a restoration of the first book, to argue as we have argued, and to maintain, as we are convinced that in the cause of truth we are bound to maintain, that that first book was not nearly so objectionable as some have represented it, and as very many have been in the habit of regarding it, that it had rejected what was decidedly Romish, and contained nothing that could strictly be accounted even distinctly Lutheran in the doctrine of the Eucharist.

Nevertheless, we are persuaded that to bring out clearly the very truth of this matter is all that is needed to make our position impregnable, and to show unprejudiced minds the validity and force of our objections to restoring or permitting the use of the first book.

We can now adopt as our own the language of the Act
ad sola verba Domini solamque Dominicam orationem consecrabatur" (De Divinis Off., lib. ii., cap. 21; in Hittorpius, p. 483). See "Recent Teachings concerning the Eucharistic Sacrifice," p. 28.

Still, the evidence of the Liturgies is certainly not to be despised, especially where *consensus* can be shown, and antiquity can be proved. It is, no doubt, quite possible to think too little, as well as to think too much, of their value. And it need by no means be supposed that their witness will be found to be all on the side of the New Theology (see especially "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 225-238).

which gives authority to Edward's second book. Cranmer could have used that language,¹ though he had thrown himself thoroughly and heartily into the work of revision which so carefully pruned the ambiguities of the first book.

But, while admitting the truth of all that is thus quoted against us by the advocates of the first book, we must be allowed also, as against their contention, to have admitted to their side the truth which is also declared in the same Act, that the revision, whose results we have in the second book, made "fully perfect" what in the first was (in some sense) imperfect.²

¹ See "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," No. vii., pp. 506, 507. When Gardiner claimed the Book of Common Prayer as (like Cranmer's "Catechism") teaching *oral manducation* ("in that it is there so Catholicly spoken of"), Cranmer answered: "The Book of Common Prayer neither useth any such speech, nor giveth any such doctrine, nor I in no point improve on that godly book, nor vary from it. But yet glad am I that the said book liketh you so well, as no man can mislike it that hath any godliness in him joined with knowledge" ("On Lord's Supper," pp. 55, 56, P.S. edit.).

There was, of course, no denying here that there was another sense which "*mistakers*" could read into "the said book." But there is good evidence here that that was not Cranmer's sense.

² Mr. Pocock, indeed, does not hesitate to regard the profession that "the new book was only a new form of the first book more fully explained and interpreted" as "a downright lie invented for political purposes" (*English Historical Review*, October, 1886, p. 681). And indeed, it may well be granted that any such assertion would have been misleading if the first book had been intended to *teach* and *enforce* the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Romish or Lutheran sense. But we are now well assured that it had no such intention. And when Mr. Pocock adds that "it was a pure invention made for the purpose of quietly getting the second Prayer-Book through the Houses of Parliament" (p. 682), he seems to me to be forgetting that the assertion is made in the very Act of Parliament itself. And I can hardly think that it will be readily believed that at such a time, and in such a cause, Parliament was persuaded to put its hand blindly to what it knew nothing about, and did not concern itself to inquire into.

Imperfection is often tolerable, and for a time may be wisely tolerated; while to return from what is fully perfect to that which is imperfect may be intolerable, a change which no right-minded man could think of tolerating for a moment.

It may be a sin to fall back on a position which once it was good to occupy. It will assuredly be a sin if it involve the abandoning of an advanced post of doctrinal truth for the sake of joining forces with dangerous doctrinal error.

It must surely be a sin if it be for the purpose of re-admitting and welcoming a doctrine which necessarily regards as heresy the doctrinal standpoint of the Reformed, which we are pledged to defend, and bound to uphold as the truth.

To occupy a certain position in a forward reforming movement may be a just cause of thankfulness and joy, but to be in the same position in a doctrinal retrogression—in a turning back from truth towards error—may be truest cause for shame and confusion of face.

But if the Act which is quoted against us speak true, it would be a serious retrogression to return to the use of the first book. It would be to desert a position of doctrinal perfection for the very purpose of re-admitting doctrinal errors or doctrinal dangers, the exclusion of which had made perfect the second book.¹

This is the point which needs to be most strongly insisted upon, and we must ask leave to return to it for a while in a concluding article.

¹It is important to observe that whereas the Communion Service of 1548 came forth professedly as a *first step* in a movement of Reform, with promise of further advances to follow, the second book of Edward VI. was accompanied with the claim *then made for the first time* of "full perfection." This stamp of completeness and *finality* distinguishes it from all previous efforts (see "Eucharistic Presence," pp. 514, 515).

CHAPTER VI.

OBSERVATIONS—(*continued*).

IT was stated at the close of our last chapter on this subject that if the Act which authorized the second book of Edward speak true, it would be a serious retrogression to return to the use of the first book. It would, under present circumstances, be deserting a position of doctrinal perfection for the purpose of re-admitting doctrinal errors or doctrinal dangers, the exclusion of which had made perfect the second book.

This is a matter so essential to our argument that we must be permitted to bespeak for it careful and candid consideration. In approving and authorizing the second book, the Church of England has established herself on a firm doctrinal position, and thereupon has set up her standard on high—a position from which it is impossible for her to recede without being false to the truth she has received. To allow the use of the first book, however *once* defensible, would be, under present circumstances, nothing less than a desertion of that position.¹

¹ While, however, we are bound jealously to guard the Reformed character of our Prayer-Book, and dare not, therefore, in our present surroundings, part with any fence of security which we may owe even to the excessive caution of our Reformers, it is well for us to be reminded that we may very well err in condemning (and even, it may be, in over-carefully shunning) all language which has been used to express doctrines which we reject. Thus we may be surrendering expressions which have been used in a sound sense by Christians of old time as well as by Reformed divines in more recent days, and virtually conceding (a very mis-

At least we cannot but fear that, in the present state of the Church of England, it would become practically equivalent

taken and disastrous concession) that they can only in fairness be used to signify the doctrines for which our opponents would claim them as exclusively their own.

And we might even find matter for congratulation in the divergent forms accepted by the Scottish and American Episcopal Churches, if only it be allowed that their interpretation should be governed by the doctrinal perfection of the English form. It was well said by Bishop Thirlwall concerning the Scotch and English services: "There is indeed a very considerable difference between the two offices, both in their structure and their language. But this I cannot consider as an evil in itself, still less as anything which ought to be a bar to the freest brotherly intercourse between two Churches which so closely agree with one another in doctrine and discipline" (Charge, 1856, p. 44).

And Bishop Charles Wordsworth, in his "Plain Tract on the Scotch Communion Office" (Edinburgh, 1859), says: "The existence of the three different offices in these three branches of the Reformed Church has the same effect in regard to doctrine as the existence of the three Creeds, which (though with very different degrees of fulness and precision of statement upon different Articles of the Faith) all harmonize together, all naturally tend to illustrate and confirm each other. And, in regard to practice, while the Church of England and the Church of America each keeps to the use of its own Formulary, and while we retain our own, as of 'primary authority,' but not so as to exclude the English where it may reasonably be desired, this course of action can have no proper effect to diminish the cordial unanimity or the actual communion which exists among us" (pp. 19, 20).

The words of Bishop Horsley's letter to Skinner have often been quoted: "I think the Scotch Office more conformable to the primitive models, and in my private judgment more edifying than that which we now use" (see Bulley's "Variations," p. 184). They should be read, however, in connection with the near context: "Nevertheless, I think our present office is very good, our form of consecration of the elements is sufficient."

Similar words quoted from Archbishop Sharp (see Bishop Jolly, "On the Eucharist," p. 123) should be set beside the teaching of his sermon on 1 Cor. xi. 23-25 (Works, vol. v., p. 190, *et seq.*; Oxford, 1829), and it will then plainly appear that he had no desire whatever to return to the doctrines which in the ambiguities of the first book seek a shelter. See especially pp. 197, 201.

lent to such a desertion. Wherein consists the perfection which the Act claims as the characteristic of the second book? It is impossible, as we maintain, to doubt the answer. Its perfection consists in its strictly and unmistakably Reformed character.¹ The work of its perfecting was the revision which manifests the scrupulous care—the perhaps even excessive carefulness—to eliminate whatever could be understood as having anything like a doubtful sound as favouring or allowing the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharistic Presence.

The first book was, in comparison of *former* services, an excellent liturgy. It was a great gain to have a Communion Office which the Reformed might well use without offence. And, taking into account that it was for the use of a National Church, it was a very wonderful step towards that perfecting of the Prayer-Book which our Reformers had in view. But, while it lopped off the topmost boughs of pernicious doctrines and made a very conspicuous change in a reforming direction, it is unquestionable that it still left some room for possible misunderstanding, some room for serious or dangerous error, and thus stood in need of a further revision which should make it, in view of these present dangers and present needs, "fully perfect." And this revision is just what it received in the second book.

But let it be well observed that this doctrinal perfection was accompanied, we may say by the sacrifice² (in some

¹ See "Eucharistic Presence," pp. 517, 521.

² Even Waterland would willingly have had retained the "memorial." He says: "It is very certain that the *commemoration, memorial or annunciation* of our Lord's *Passion*, with an address to God for His *propitious* favour thereupon, has been a very ancient, eminent and solemn part of the Communion Service. There is now no direct formal application of that kind in our liturgies. There was in King Edward's Liturgy of 1549, in these words: 'We, Thy humble servants, do celebrate and make here

sense), of somewhat which we should naturally have expected our Reformers to have been very slow, and even

before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the *memorial*,¹ etc. . . . Why this part was struck out in the *review*, I know not, unless it was owing to some scruple (which, however, was needless) about making the memorial *before God*, which at that time might appear to give some umbrage to the Popish *sacrifice*, among such as knew not how to distinguish" ("Works," vol. iv., p. 607; Oxford, 1843. See also p. 486, and vol. v., p. 295).

Probably Waterland may not have observed (as Mr. Scudamore has, "Not. Euch.," p. 647, 2nd edit.) that the ancient Ambrosian Canon seems to have had no such "direct formal application" (see Muratori, "Liturgia Romana Vetus," tom. i., cc. 131-134).

It may be very readily admitted that some of the omissions in the second book might be restored with far less doctrinal danger than others. But as regards this quotation from Waterland, it should be observed (1) that the *memorial* in his view is altogether without the "Real Objective Presence." This, in view of *our* controversies, is most important. (2) That (although he elsewhere—vol. iv., p. 509—rather labours to give to ἀνάμνησις a fulness of meaning beyond what it seems to us naturally to convey) his *memorial* is the *memorial* of ἀνάμνησις not of a μνημόσυνον (*i.e.*, in the sense in which it is connected with a sacrificial offering—a θυσία μνημοσύνου. See Abbott's "Reply to Supple," p. 41). It may suffice, in evidence of this, to quote these words: "The Archetypal sacrifice itself is what no one but Christ Himself could offer, whether really or symbolically. We *represent* it, we do not offer it in the Eucharist" (vol. iv., p. 750). But other evidence may be seen in "Missarum Sacrificia," pp. 217, 218. It should also be noted that, although μνημόσυνον is translated "memorial," it is not, in its *technical* meaning, to be understood in a *commemorative* sense as a calling to mind of a *past* event (which is the very sense in which Waterland advocates the *memorial*, and which is also the sense in which the words of the Liturgy might more fairly be understood). The azkârâh (as Professor Abbott has observed) was a present calling to mind of the worshipper before God by the real offering on the altar of a part for the whole (see Abbott's Essays, pp. 123, 127). It can scarcely be needful to add, that the Greek μνημόσυνον has also frequently in the LXX. a wider meaning, admitting a relation to a past event, as, *e.g.*, in Josh. iv. 7). (3) That the language of the liturgies generally (as well as of many of the Fathers) may be pleaded as against the μνημόσυνον sense of the *memorial* (see "Recent Teachings concerning the Eucharistic Sacrifice," pp. 10-14). (4) That in our own days, as well as at the

loath, to part with. The generally conservative character of the English Reformation¹ might almost make us marvel at some of the changes introduced into the second book.² In view of the characteristic tendencies of our Reformers in the matter of their liturgical services, those changes are some³ of them unaccountable upon any other principle than this, that arguments based on what may be called liturgical precedents must yield to cogent reasons having to do with securing and safeguarding doctrinal purity.

We do not wonder at all that wise, and learned, and faithful, and holy men, liturgical scholars, in after-days, when all danger of such false doctrine seemed far away, and the Reformed character of the Church of England was universally recognised, should have sometimes expressed something like a wish for the restoration, in part, of that which the second book had cast away. We could even sympathize with a desire for somewhat to be added to our present book which

time of the Reformation, there are those who know not "how to distinguish," and that our present dangers seem to witness that the *scruple* of our Reformers was not so *needless* as Waterland seems to have supposed.

It is also to be observed that (to use the words of Mr. Scudamore, "Not. Euch.," p. 651) "in none of the most ancient memorials does the priest profess to make an oblation of the Body and Blood of Christ, much less of Christ Himself. They are strictly commemorative."

¹ See "Eucharistic Presence," pp. 443-446, 508-511.

² Canon Dixon has justly observed—speaking of the first book of Edward—"that the conservative spirit of the compilers was more manifest in the Breviary and the Offices than in the Missal" ("History of Church of England," vol. iii., p. 16).

³ Possibly some of them may be accounted for by the influence of the Mozarabic Rite. See Mr. Burbidge's "Liturgeries and Offices," pp. 175-177, 199-201, as well as his paper in *Guardian* of March 12, 1890, and Mr. Warren's letter of March 22. But see also Gasquet's "Edward VI.," pp. 185, 186.

is to be found in the first¹ if only we could be quite sure that there would be no danger in the change—no danger of its seeming to open a door for the inroads of superstition and the bringing back of false doctrine.

We do not marvel at all that the Episcopal Churches of Scotland and America made adventures in the direction of undoing somewhat of that which the extreme caution of our Reformers had done in the reign of Edward VI. Nor are we much surprised that the impetus given of late to the study of liturgical lore should have moved some among them to the desire for a yet further revision, and perhaps a nearer approach to ancient liturgical models. But we do not feel sure that their history does not supply a warning, if warning were needed—a lesson of danger which we should learn to avoid, a teaching which should justify the action of our Reformers, and make us thankful that they had the wisdom to bid their liturgical preferences all give precedence to a supreme regard for incorruptness of doctrine.

And our approval of the Liturgical changes made in their service for the Holy Communion must ever be limited by the proviso that it should always be well understood that the Liturgical *doctrine* should be interpreted according to the standard of the *full perfection* (doctrinally) of the English Office.

¹ It is obvious that there may be an agreement in expressing approval of the first book among those whose agreement can carry them no further.

Those who highly approved of the first book as a most laudable and courageous step forward in the progress of Reformation, and as a most godly form of service in comparison to that which it was meant to supersede, but who regarded it as made perfect by the second book, stood on a doctrinal standpoint entirely different from that of those who can endure the use of the second book only as a fallen representative of the first, and therefore appeal to the Act's approval of the first in order to make the first appear more perfect than the second.

And for ourselves, we are quite sure that the present is no time for us to be thinking of change. The question of liturgical precedents is the question of that which the highest liturgical authorities will testify to be only a matter of following the lead in that which, for the most part (even though probably framed, in part, on ancient Jewish forms¹) is merely human in origin.² The halo of venerable antiquity (and that antiquity sometimes rather doubtful) is the most that can be claimed for that, the rejection of which some will still lament as our loss.

But the question of preserving the purity of our Reformed faith is the question of the hour—is the question (we fear) of imminent danger, the question assuredly of tremendous responsibility. What we might think of doing, if there were no peril, is a question which must wait, at least, till the peril is gone. We have now a religious atmosphere charged with those very dangerous elements (and even in far more dangerous conditions) which made that careful revision of our Communion Service essential to the making fully perfect of our Book of Common Prayer.

Language which might be piously and safely used in a time when words were interpreted according to the limitations required by common-sense, becomes full of danger in an age when the merit of faith is measured by its capacity of believ-

¹ See Cassander, "Liturgica," cap. i., op., pp. 10, 11, Paris, 1616. Dr. Probst has argued that the Clementine Liturgy was the oldest form of Liturgical service, and was used in the Church of Antioch till superseded by that of St. Basil. And Bickell has endeavoured to show that of all ancient Liturgies the Clementine is the one in which can be traced the nearest correspondence with the Jewish forms. See Dr. Skene's "The Lord's Supper and the Passover Ritual," pp. xi and 183-194, 209-215, 217. On the antiquity of the Jewish Passover Ritual, see pp. 129-141. Some strictures on the theories of these writers will be found in the *Guardian* of July 27, 1892.

² See "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," No. vii., pp. 553, 560.

ing contradictions (see "Lectures on Lord's Supper," pp. 29-31). And ambiguous expressions, which may convey only a sound sense in the surroundings of sound teaching, may need to be carefully avoided or distinctly guarded when minds are being as waves tossed to and fro, and carried about with new winds of doctrine. And especially should the introduction of such ambiguities be avoided where there is reason to fear that the change is desired in the interest of false or dangerous doctrine.

The point we have to insist upon—and we cannot too strongly insist upon it—is this: Our Communion Service is a distinctly "Reformed" Office, and we are bound to be defenders of its "Reformed" character. Can we be faithful to our charge if we allow doctrinal *distinctness* to be changed into doctrinal *indistinctness* for the sake of sheltering dangerous doctrinal error, and making our Church to be no longer numbered among the Churches of the "Reformed"? ¹

It is impossible to ignore the fact that we have around us the felt influences of that new Church of England as we now know it, and as we know it to have been (in some sense) founded by Cardinal Newman, and built upon by those who are no friends to the faith of the "Reformed."

We can express approbation of the first book, in the sense

¹ Let the reader be asked to compare with modern (so-called) "Catholic doctrine" the *Catholic* teaching contained in the following extract, with its faithful witness (albeit a Laudian witness) to the true principles of the English Reformation and of our Reformed Prayer-Book: "Confirmation is by the Church of Rome, that now is corrupted with many errors and novelties in religion, held to be a Sacrament. But we, who by the grace of God are numbered among the Reformed Churches, whereof this Church of England is, both for doctrine and discipline, the most eminent and the most pure, the most agreeable to Scripture and antiquity of all others, we hold it to be none" (MS. notes of "Preface" to Confirmation Service, inserted in Cosin's corrected copy of the Book of Common Prayer; see Parker's "Introduction," p. cclx).

in which our Reformers approved it, and can acknowledge that its depravers were “mistakers” in fastening on its ambiguities a sense which did not of necessity belong to them, and which they were not intended to bear. It is the first book, as explained by the second, and perfected by that explanation, which was “the very godly order,” “agreeable to the Word of God and the primitive Church,” in the view of our Reformers, and of the Act of Uniformity. And as so explained it is not less a very godly order in our view still. But it is just this explanation which our new Theologians would have us reject.

We are alluding, of course, not to any school of true Anglo-Catholic theology, faithful to the principles of our Reformation and the doctrine of our Articles, such as the Church of England has delighted to honour, but to a new Romanizing party, which can never fairly be identified with it.

Who are they—the leaders in the party of attack—who are now knocking at the doors, eager in their demands to have restored to us the usages disallowed in the perfecting of our Liturgy, in the revision of the second book of Edward? Are they men with views in harmony with the doctrine of our Reformers? Are they not those who would sacrifice what we know to be Protestant truth for the sake of attaining some sort of corporate union with Rome, or some sort of recognition by the Papacy?

Is their aim only liturgical improvement for liturgical reasons’ sake? Have they not avowed, will they not acknowledge, that their desire is to supply what they regard as deficiencies, only or mainly for doctrine’s sake?¹ Have we

¹ We venture to quote the following words, and to ask for them renewed attention:

“It is impossible to view the changes made in the Second Prayer-Book of Edward VI. apart from their doctrinal significance. The First Prayer-Book might have been used in a Communion which rejected the Real

not here the new Church of England, as founded by the new Oxford School, seeking to put its new wine into the old

Objective Presence. But it certainly would not have borne witness, as the Second does, and still more as the *change* from the First to the Second does, that this Church of England *hath* (to use Whitgift's words) refused the Real Presence.

“ And the question of restoring the use, or the permission to use the First Communion Service instead of the Second, cannot now be entertained apart from views of doctrinal significance. Upon merely liturgical grounds, some might regret that the changes made in Edward's days were so thorough and sweeping, who yet must be deeply thankful that those changes were made, and still stand, to testify to our Reformers' sense of the danger, and wise determination, as far as might be, to exclude the possibility of the growing up again of the doctrine they rejected. So, again, opinions may be quoted of preference for the First Book from some eminent divines (see Medd's Introduction to Walton's 'First Book of Edward VI.', p. xvi, *sqq.*); and if we saw no danger and no possibility of the bringing in again the doctrine, for rejecting which many of our Reformers died, those opinions might be entitled to considerable liturgical weight. But if anything be wanting to justify the wisdom of our Reformers, and to make us grateful for having the *Second* Prayer-Book instead of the *First*, surely it may be found in the shelter which such expressions of opinion seem to afford for those who in our days (when the danger is realized) would desire to undo the work of the Reformers, and therefore on doctrinal grounds would bring in the First Book to crush out the very truth, to which the Second bears such important testimony.

“ Moreover, when it is pleaded that the Act of Uniformity, which authorized Edward's *Second* Book, speaks with approval of the *First*, it must be observed (1) that such approval is modified by the words which speak of the *Second* as made *more perfect*, and (2) that such approval is clearly given to the *First* as *explained* by the *Second* (see the words 'As well for the more plain and manifest explanation hereof as for the more perfection of the said order of common service . . . the King's most excellent Majesty . . . hath caused the foresaid order of common service to be faithfully and godly perused, explained, and made fully perfect')—that is to say, that expressions in the *First* Book being capable of two senses, the *Second* Book takes away from it one, and stamping clearly the other sense, so approves it.

“ This being so, it must be obvious that it is quite vain for those who now dislike the *Second* Book, and desire to return to the *First*, to bring

bottles of a Reformed Communion? And what shall we think of this attempt to put the new wine of a developed mediævalism—a revived unscriptural sacerdotalism teaching for doctrines the commandments of men—into the old bottles of a Liturgy revised to receive only the doctrine of the old faith¹—the faith once for all delivered to the saints? Shall we willingly consent to have the perfection of our Liturgy destroyed—our bottles burst by this insidious design of forcing the new into the old?

Let it not be supposed for a moment that we would desire to draw too sharply the line of limitation which surrounds the teaching of the most Catholic Church in Christendom. Far be it from us to desire to make this Church of England the Church of any one narrow school of thought. We may not, indeed, remove our ancient landmarks, nor take down the fences which our forefathers have set up to defend for us the doctrines of the Reformation. But our wisdom, not forward in their support from the Act of Uniformity, or from the writings of our Reformers, expressions of approval of the *First Book* (see 'The Church and the World,' 1866, 3rd edit., pp. 323, 476; and Cooke's letter to Perry, 'Of Ceremonies,' etc., p. 113). What they want, to give any real support to their position, and what we ask them (in no captious spirit) to produce if they can, is an expression (either in the Act or in the writings of our Reformers) of distinct and decided *preference* for the *First*, or *regret* for the changes made in the *Second*, and in particular an expression of adherence to that *doctrinal sense* admissible (or apparently admissible) in the *First*, which finds no place in the explanation of the *Second Book of Edward*. We have no quarrel with our Reformers, nor with the Act of Uniformity for speaking well of the *First Book*. Even the Westminster Assembly say of the Prayer-Book that 'it occasioned many godly and learned men to rejoice much in it at that time it was set forth, because the Mass and the rest of the Latin service being removed, the public worship was celebrated in our own tongue' (Preface to Directory).—"Papers on Eucharistic Presence," pp. 517-519.

¹ Speaking of what was then termed the *old* and the *new learning*, Cranmer said: "That which they call the *old* is the *new*, and that which they call the *new* is indeed the *old*" ("Letters," P.S., p. 450).

less than our charity, demands of us that we should rather seek widely to stretch than tightly to strain the cord which marks the true comprehension of our Anglican Communion.

This is no question at all of severely pressing the limits of our boundaries, to restrain the freedom of thought of individual theologians. It is the question of going out of our way to make room for a party in whose view the doctrine of the English Reformation is only a heresy.

It is the question of loosing from our moorings in very uncertain weather, and hoisting up our mainsail to the wind to be carried whither we know not, only far away (as it seems) from the Church of our fathers, far away from the faith of the Reformed, far away (as we fear) from the teaching of Apostles and prophets, far away from the truth of Christ's Gospel.

If the view which has been presented in these papers of the History of our Prayer-Book be a true view, there is an urgent call to us to speak out. It is not a time for silence. It is time to speak the truth—albeit, to speak the truth in love.

Let our brethren be entreated to consider well that the question before us is one the answer to which should be governed by a view of the present difficulties and dangers which surround us. In view of our new surroundings, in view of the oncoming force of a Church of England as founded by Cardinal Newman, shall we be willing to desert our position because of the doubtful or mistaken results of our liturgical studies? Shall we be willing to change our sides on the ground that some there have been—admirers of the first book of Edward—who were true to our Articles and faithful to the doctrine of the Reformed? Would *they* have been on the side of the new-founded Church of England? Would even Cosin himself have said a word in defence of

this new claim? I am very confident he would have been among the first and foremost in resistance.¹

We may be thankful that there are those whose eyes are being enlightened to see the dangers and the errors of the party in advance, and are turning back to be guided by truer and safer counsels.

And we may surely hope that, as time advances and increased light is thrown upon the subject from the by-paths of history and the study of English theology, many will be brought to see how strangely the new school has departed from the theology of our English divines, and how urgent is the call to all true English Catholics to return to the old paths and the faith of our martyred Reformers.

Anyhow, let us beware of falling into the error of supposing that pleas for comprehension are to be listened to only on the side of the *new*-founded Church of England. Has there been no silent exodus of those who loved the old? Are there none among our faithful laity now beginning in sorrowful suspicion to look at the door—a door by which many from outside might quietly be coming in but for the dread of this inroad of the new?

At all events, if there be a danger—as we sometimes fear there may be—a danger approaching, and perhaps not very far off—the danger of making important concessions for the sake of maintaining a National Church²—the danger of

¹ See “*Missarum Sacrificia*,” p. 164.

² We must confess to the feeling that some word of caution (if not of alarm) may be called for in view of some recent proposals for facilitating rubrical alterations.

That the Prayer-Book, with all the details of its rubrical directions, should be regarded as stereotyped for ever is an idea which the Prayer-Book itself distinctly condemns. That certain regulations might be made more elastic is, beyond reasonable question, a thing to be desired.

But permission of *such* change should be well safeguarded against possibility of *doctrinal* shifting.

liturgical changes for the very purpose of giving legal and legitimate standing-place to doctrines which the Church of England has rejected as errors, opening the door at the demand of those who would bring in again what we regard as the very dangerous deceits for the rejection of which our forefathers laid down their lives—who desire above all things to set up anew, clothed and adorned, and arrayed in gorgeous apparel, a doctrine—a doctrine which is the natural parent of a worship—a worship which, if the doctrine be not true (as we are convinced it is not), must (even by the teaching of its own teachers) be material idolatry; in other words, a doctrine which, being false, can only be made non-idolatrous by being proved true—then we feel called upon to utter one word of most solemn warning (it is a solemn word, in the uttering of which we are persuaded we shall be discharging the true duty of a watchman and acting as the mouthpiece of thousands of the most faithful and attached laymen of our communion who are desiring to be led, not by any hasty impulse of party spirit, but by the force of the truest, deepest, most sacred convictions): WE MUST BEWARE HOW, *for the sake of maintaining its national character (or giving it a more all-embracing position), WE SHAPE FOR OURSELVES, OR REFOUND FOR OURSELVES (or recognise as refounded for us by Cardinal Newman), A NATIONAL CHURCH, THE MAINTENANCE OF WHICH WOULD BE A NATIONAL SIN.*

The following words of the greatest of English divines cannot be too often quoted: “Tell us not that ye will sacrifice to the Lord our God, if we will sacrifice to Ashtaroth or Melcom; that ye will read our Scriptures, if we will listen to your traditions; that if ye may have a Mass by permission, we may have a Communion with good leave and liking; that ye will admit the things that are spoken by the Apostles of our Lord Jesus, if your Lord and Master may

have his ordinances observed and his statutes kept. Solomon took it (as well he might) for an evident proof that she did not bear a motherly affection to her child which yielded to have it cut in divers parts. He cannot love the Lord Jesus with his heart which lendeth one ear to His Apostles and another to false apostles; which can brook to see a mingle-mangle of religion and superstition, ministers and massing-priests, truth and error, traditions and Scriptures. No; we have no Lord but Jesus; no doctrine but the Gospel; no teachers but His Apostles. Were it reason to require at the hand of an English subject obedience to the laws and edicts of the Spaniard? I do marvel that any man bearing the name of a servant of the servants of Jesus Christ will go about to draw us from our allegiance" (Hooker, Sermon I. on Jude 17-21; Works, vol. iii., p. 666, edit. Keble).

But it may be said, as in answer to this, that times have changed since Hooker wrote. No change of times or circumstances can ever make it safe or right for a National Church to become the home of such a mingle-mangle as must come of the attempt to combine the doctrine of the Lord's Supper with the doctrine of the Romish Mass.¹ In

¹ See above, pp. 80, 81. See also "Romish Mass and English Church," pp. 29-39. Let the reader be asked to mark well the antithesis in Hooker's teaching between (1) the Mass and the Gospel, and (2) the Mass and Communion. This is just the antithesis which our Reformers saw embodied in the distinction between the *altar* and the *table* (see above, pp. 26, 27), and which made them (without condemning the name of the one, as rightly explained, and without desiring to make any man an offender for a word) so jealously careful to remove the one, and to hold to the other.

Shall we not honour them for their steadfastness of purpose, and be thankful for their faithful testimony—the witness of which abides in the Book of Common Prayer—even if some (who hold fast to their doctrine) may think that their caution might have been less rigorous?

So Queen Mary's reign was marked by the setting up again of altars, which were again cast out and destroyed on the accession of Elizabeth.

the interest of comprehension we may well lift up our voice against any endeavours to break down our fences for the

(See e.g., especially Machyn's "Diary," p. 399; Camden Society, and Queen Elizabeth's Inquisitions, in Cardwell's "Documentary Annals," vol. i., p. 189.) And, whereas the Mass had been restored in Mary's reign, on Elizabeth's accession, the Ministers were required to acknowledge that the doctrine of the Mass (as a propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and dead) was "most ungodly and most injurious to the precious redemption of our Saviour Christ" (see Cardwell's "Doc. Annals," vol. i., pp. 233, 234).

Abundant evidence might be produced to show how thoroughly well understood was the distinction and opposition between "the Mass" and "the Communion," and how clearly the Church of England was understood to have rejected the one in accepting the other.

In "Tracts for the Times," No. 86, the changes in our Services made by our Reformers are regarded as "a taking from us of part of our ancient inheritance—a withdrawal of our higher privileges—a thrusting us aside, and bidding us to take the *lower place*, the position of suppliant, and to 'weep between the porch and the altar.' And in this sense, the substitution of the term 'table,' 'holy table,' etc., for that of 'altar,' is a strong instance of this, our judicial humiliation. For what is this but to say that the higher mysteries, which the word 'Altar' represents, are partially withdrawn from view?" (See "Essays on the Church," p. 152. See also Cudworth's "Discourse concerning Lord's Supper," ch. v., pp. 27, 28: edit. 1676.)

But when St. Paul would magnify his office in the highest language of sacerdotal dignity, he represents himself as *ἱερουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ* (Rom. xv. 16; see the context, and Cramer, "Catenæ," vol. iv., pp. 504, 506; Oxford, 1844).

When he would set the office of the Christian ministry beside the office of the Jewish priesthood as having like claims on the Church's liberality, he cites the ordinance for the Jews—that they which wait at the altar are partakers of the altar; but for the Christian Church he can bring the parallel no nearer than this—"Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel" (1 Cor. ix. 14).

When he would set beside the partaking of heathen sacrificial feasts, that which should most resemble it in the ordinances of the Christian Church, he can only bring a "table" for the Christians into comparison with an "altar" for the heathens.

In 1 Cor. x. 21, St. Paul is speaking of meats offered in sacrifice. Such meats (as Professor Abbott well observes) "were placed for the purpose

purpose of comprehending the teaching of essential and vital antagonisms.

One word may be permitted in conclusion. It is not only a time for speaking the truth in love. It is surely a time for calling upon our God, showing Him the helplessness of our great need, and spreading out before Him the causes of our sorrow and our shame. It is surely a time that those who have been taught to know the Gospel of Christ (the Gospel of free justification for the ungodly) as the power of God unto salvation, should unite in importunate prayer and continual supplication, that the Spirit of the Lord may lift up a standard against the on-coming waves and waters of error, that so men may see and acknowledge the good hand of our God upon us, and in lowly adoration may learn the lesson of Divine instruction—"Not by might or by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts."

of being eaten, not on the altar, but on a table, so that those who ate of them might be said to partake either of the altar of the false gods, or of their table. Why does the Apostle, having just used the expression 'partakers with [or ' of '] the altar,' now substitute the word 'table,' especially when 'altar' would have appeared more forcible? I can conceive no other answer to this question than this: that he could not say 'the altar of the Lord,' and therefore in order to preserve the antithesis, he substitutes, not 'table' for 'altar,' but 'partakers with [or ' of '] the table' for 'partakers with [or ' of '] the altar.' The passage is so far from proving that St. Paul calls the Lord's table an altar, that it proves the contrary" (Reply to Mr. Supple, p. 51).

APPENDIX.

NOTE A.

ON CERTAIN WORDS AND EXPRESSIONS REMAINING IN THE LITURGY, WHICH ARE ALLEGED AS GIVING SUPPORT OR SHELTER FOR NOVEL DOCTRINES OF THE EUCHARIST.

NOTE B.

ON THE CHANGE OF EXPRESSION IN THE BLACK RUBRIC, AND THE CAUSES WHICH MADE THE CHANGE DESIRABLE.

APPENDIX.

NOTE A.

See Page 35.

I HAD judged it unnecessary in the preceding chapters to answer the arguments of those who have in our own times appealed to certain expressions in our Communion Service as supporting the novel doctrines of the Oxford School of Theology.

But, inasmuch as it appears that there are still those who think that there is that in the language of our Liturgy which warrants the teaching of much more than the doctrine of the "Reformed," I have thought it well to reproduce here a few extracts from No. VII. of my "Papers on the Doctrine of the Eucharistic Presence."

Let it not seem to be said unkindly when I say that it cannot but strike one, as arguing forcibly against any real strength in their position, that in dealing with the service for the Holy Communion the maintainers of the Real Objective Presence are found to build their argument so much upon what may fairly be called small matters, some of them mere *minutiæ* and grammatical niceties.

When we enter on an examination of this service, surely we are entering on that which should yield us at once, abundantly and unmistakably, the teaching of our Church's doctrines on the subject of the Eucharist.

Surely great truths—truths to be taught and held as *de fide*—should not here be left to be laboriously spun out of thin threads, the spiders' webs of minute verbal and grammatical criticisms.

Those whose views I am here opposing must allow me to say—not at all, I trust, in anything like a spirit of triumph over what appears to me their weakness, but simply in a desire to bring the true state of the case (as it seems to me) clearly and forcibly

before my readers—that such an examination of the service as these criticisms rise out of seems almost like the microscopical examination of some palimpsest manuscript, in which curious eyes desire to decipher¹ some characters of the older and ob-

¹ So it was said, as a just ground of complaint, of old: “They tried it [i.e., Edward’s first book] by points and syllables, and weighed every word” (see Jeremy Taylor in *Works*, vol. v., p. 237).

The maintainers of the “Real Objective Presence” cannot, I think, but be sensible of the minuteness and frailty of the threads to which they are constrained to cling, when they attempt an appeal to the Communion Service.

It is admitted, indeed, by the writer of the eighty-first of “Tracts for the Times,” that of the doctrine of the sacrifice there are but “SLIGHT indications.” And this is attributed to the “disciplina arcani” of the Anglican Church (see Goode’s “Rule of Faith,” vol. ii., p. 350). Mr. Humphry, while aiming at finding shelter for them, speaks of the doctrines of the Objective Presence, and of the Eucharistic Sacrifice as left “to be found by those who seek them in a FEW expressions which are of doubtful and disputed interpretation.” And again he says that service “contains phrases of ambiguous meaning, in which those disputed doctrines are believed to have found a refuge, like the prophets in the caves of the earth” (“Principles at Stake,” pp. 289, 290). One can scarcely help asking, Did it look as if Israel’s own teaching was the teaching of the prophets, when those prophets hid themselves in the dens and the caves? Does it look as if the teaching of the Church of England is the teaching of doctrines on the Eucharist, which dare not show their heads in our Communion Service, but are to be found, if found at all, hid, as it were in the dens and caves of the earth?

It should be observed that these “dens and caves” in our Service seem to be of quite recent discovery. Let the reader be asked to peruse Baxter’s paper, “The Exceptions against the Common Prayer which I offered the Brethren when they were drawing up theirs” in “Reliquæ Baxterianæ” (or Baxter’s “Narrative of his Life and Times”), p. 308, *sqq.*, London, 1696, and especially p. 312, also the exceptions to the Prayer-Book presented at the Savoy Conference (especially Cardwell’s Conferences, pp. 318-323), as well as other publications of Puritan exceptions to the Book of Common Prayer; and he can hardly fail to observe how the discerning eye of the Puritan failed to detect those lurking places of the Corporal Presence, which by some seem to be regarded as clearly revealing themselves under the glass of the Ritualist.

Let it be asked, Is there anything remaining in our Communion Service so sacrificial as the following? “See here Christ dying in this

literated writing, discernible yet under the plain and obvious marking of a more recent hand. Or, perhaps, in some cases it may be more like the straining of the eyes to discover whether our Reformers, after ruling their lines straight, have always exactly kept to those lines ; whether a very minute and searching investigation may not discover some small strokes perhaps a little too high, or some turns a little too low, while the broad and clear characters which meet the naked eye are seen all following their line too plainly, and marking their sense too clearly and distinctly to admit of a question.

To aim at answering all such criticisms as these appears to me to be giving them an undue importance.

Nevertheless, since it is not pleasant to have shown to us, by an oxyhydrogen microscope, black monsters in a drop of water, and then to be told that this water is what we are drinking every day, it may be worth while to take one or two examples, by which it may be seen that as sometimes dark shadows may be cast from some fault in the lens, instead of from some terrible pollution in the liquid, so some of these microscopical revelations of what we should regard as false teaching in our Prayer-Book may be found, after all, to have in them nothing so very formidable.

I. One such example¹—and it appears to be thought to involve

holy representation ! Behold the sacrificed Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world ! It is His will to be thus frequently crucified before our eyes." Yet this is a part of the exhortation in the Savoy Liturgy, composed by Baxter (see Hall's "Reliquiæ Liturgicæ," vol. iv., p. 61).

What Bishop Hall thought of the teaching of our Liturgy will be seen by the following quotation : "Since, therefore, the body of Christ cannot be said to be corporally present or received by us, it must needs follow that there is *no way* of His presence or receipt in the Sacrament *but SPIRITUAL*, which the Church of England hath laboured *so fully to express*, both in her Holy Liturgy and publickly authorized Homilies, that there is *no one point of Divine truth* which she hath more punctually and plainly laid down before us" (Bishop Hall's Works, vol. ix., p. 370 ; edit. Pratt, 1808).

¹ See "Sequel to Kiss of Peace," p. 336, *sqq.*; also Grueber's "Answer to Dr. Heurtley," pp. 15, 16; and "Letter to Archbishop of Canterbury," 1856, pp. 17, 18, 33, 34; and Second Letter, pp. 24, 25; and Bishop Forbes, "On Articles," vol. ii., p. 577.

a most serious difficulty for us—is found in the first exhortation, where it is said that “God hath given His Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ . . . to be our spiritual food and sustenance *in that holy Sacrament, which*, being so divine . . . to them who receive it worthily, and so dangerous to them that presume to receive it unworthily,” etc. Here a dilemma is before us. The antecedent of “*which*” must be “*holy Sacrament*.” We are to choose our sense of “*holy Sacrament*.” Does its sense here include the *res Sacramenti*? If we answer “No,” then we are told that our Saviour Jesus Christ, our food and sustenance, must be “*in the elements*.” If we answer “Yes,” then we must acknowledge that some presume to receive, and do receive, the *res sacramenti*, *i.e.*, the Body and Blood of Christ, unworthily. Choose which we will, we are to find ourselves brought to the acknowledgment, somehow, of the “*Real Objective Presence*.”

But is it anything very strange or unnatural to understand “*that holy Sacrament*” to signify the whole ordinance?¹ And if not, where, then, is there any shadow of a difficulty remaining?

¹ I have thought this (as being more simple) preferable to saying that “*Holy Sacrament*” is to be understood as signifying “*the outward and visible signs in their consecrated relationship to Christ’s institution, and His presence of grace and power in the ordinance*.”

Our Reformers and their successors, with all their distinct repudiation of the Corporal Presence, did not hesitate sometimes to speak of the *res sacramenti* as being, *in a certain sense*, in the *Sacramentum*, by reason of this relationship; not, of course, *in the outward sign*, as being (in any sense) *contained in it*; not, of course, *in it viewed simply in itself*, but *in it as viewed in connexion with the promise contained in the Saviour’s institution, which connexion alone gives it a true title to the name of Sacrament; in it (in a word) viewed ONLY as the ordinance of Christ*.

The reader may be asked to mark specially the following words of Bishop Reynolds, who was himself on the Commission of the Savoy Conference (on the Presbyterian side), and was, moreover, the composer (in all probability) of our General Thanksgiving: “As, by faith, we have the evidence,—so, by the Sacrament, we have the *presence* of things farthest *distant and absent* from us. . . . In this Sacrament we do most willingly acknowledge a *real, true, and perfect presence of Christ*,—not *in*, with or under the elements, considered *absolutely in themselves*, but with that *relative HABITUDE and RESPECT* which they have unto the *immediate use, whereunto they are consecrated*” (Works, vol. iii., p. 68; edit. 1826).

II. Another example is set before us as presenting a very serious difficulty indeed.

Cranmer says: "All that love and believe Christ himself, let them not think that Christ is corporally in the bread. . . . For He is not in it, neither spiritually, as He is in man, nor corporally, as He is in heaven, but *only sacramentally*, as a thing may be said to be *in the figure*, whereby it is signified" (Cranmer, "On Lord's Supper," p. 238).

Again, Cranmer writes: "And therefore you gather of my sayings unjustly, that Christ is indeed absent; for I say (according to God's Word and the doctrine of the old writers) that Christ is present in His Sacraments, as they teach also that He is present in His Word, when He worketh mightily by the same in the hearts of the hearers; by which manner of speech it is not meant that Christ is corporally present in the voice or sound of the speaker (which sound perisheth as soon as the words be spoken), but this speech meaneth that He worketh with His Word, using the voice of the speaker as His instrument to work by, as He useth also His Sacraments, *whereby He worketh, and therefore is said to be present in them*" (Cranmer, "On Lord's Supper," p. 11. Compare Preface to edit. 1551).

The whole force of the objection seems to rest on the misconception that, because in our view the "*sacramentum*" may be separated from the "*res sacramenti*," therefore the word "*sacrament*" cannot in our view be regarded as *connoting* anything beyond what is outward and visible. Whereas Beza is but expressing the true view of our Reformers when he bids us see in the Sacraments the signs and pledges of Christ's body and blood, and "that in *such sort* that the same thing which is signified is offered to us to be received spiritually" (see Fulke, "Defence of Translation," p. 502).

Hooker says that sacraments "*consist altogether in* RELATION TO some such gift or grace supernatural as only God can bestow" (edit. Keble, vol. ii., p. 219).

Ursinus says: "Hæ duæ res, nempe signum et res signata, uniuntur in hoc sacramento, non copulatione aliqua physica . . . sed significacione, obsignatione, et exhibitione unius per alteram, hoc est *unione sacramentali*, cuius nexus est hæc promissio pani addita, postulans fidem utentium. Unde patet, eas res in usu legitimo semper conjunctim exhiberi et percipi, sed non sine fide promissionis, intuente et apprehendente rem promissam in *sacramento præsentem*: NON tamen *præsentem* vel inclusam in signo, ut in vasculo, sed *præsentem* in promissione, quæ est pars potior, et anima sacramenti. Inepti enim sunt qui clamant, corpus Christi non posse esse in *sacramento præsens*, nisi sit in *pane vel sub pane*. Quasi vero

The difficulty is in the very words of administration : “ The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.”

It is expressed in the following words taken from “ Fragments, by Edward Husband, Priest of the Church of England” (Palmer) : “ If, then, the BREAD is not the BLESSED BODY . . . I am guilty of a FALSEHOOD every time I use those words, and knowingly DECEIVE the hearts of the Faithful by declaring It to be what It is not. . . . But what will you say of us, the Priests of the Most High God, if we at Holy Communion offer you That which we certify by our words to be ‘ the body and blood ’ of the Lord, and all the time ourselves believe it to be nothing more or less than earthly bread and wine, to be received in remembrance of an absent Christ ? Why, I think you would say, ‘ Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost ? ’

“ Oh ! sooner far than uttering these ‘ words of administration ’ without believing in what they say, in our own souls, let us resign our position altogether, and seek some place where we should not SEAR our conscience by UTTERING with our lips what we do NOT believe in our hearts ” (pp. 11, 12).

I must profess myself unable¹ to see WHERE, in the words alluded to, is to be found that which Mr. Husband considers must be such an insuperable difficulty to us.

But I rather think, wherever the difficulty may be supposed to lie, the argument of Mr. Husband will be sufficiently met by asking ONE question. What WOULD Mr. Husband have thought of our bondage if, instead of having on our souls the burden solus panis absque promissione sit sacramentum aut præcipua pars sacramenti ” (Ursinus, “ Explicatio Catechet,” in Works, vol. i., p. 266 ; edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612).

¹ “ For the other exceptions, there is very little in them, whether the minister lay his hand on the sacred elements when he repeats the words of institution, as at this time, or only consecrates them by the prayers of the Church and the words of Christ, without any other ceremony as heretofore ; whether, with the Church of Rome, we use only the words of Christ in the distribution ; or, with most of the Reformed Churches, the other expression, ‘ Take, and eat this,’ etc., or (as we choose rather) join them both together ; whether we sing the *Gloria in Excelsis Deo* before or after the receiving ” (Archbishop Wake in Gibson’s “ Preservative,” vol. x., p. 79).

which the Church of England has laid on us, we had in its place the yoke which would have been imposed by the Westminster Assembly, who in their Directory appoint the minister to "break the bread and give it to the communicants," saying, "Take ye, eat ye,¹ THIS IS THE BODY OF CHRIST which is broken for you ; do this in remembrance of Him" ?

Apply the same rule to the words of distribution, and if it might make the Church of England seem to be Lutheran, the Puritan divines might be judged to be Papists.

III. One more example (and it is alleged as one of great force) shall be taken.

The argument is derived from the words of the Prayer of Humble Access : "Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink His blood, that our sinful bodies," etc.

It is alleged that, as a necessary consequence of the words of this prayer, it must be possible so² to eat the Flesh of Christ and to drink His Blood as that our sinful bodies may NOT be made clean by His Body, nor our souls washed in His most precious Blood. If so, then it must be possible to receive the *res Sacra-menti* unworthily. And to say that the unworthy receive the *res Sacra-menti* is to make a presence "objective" in the elements, and independent of faith in the heart.

But surely there is no real difficulty in understanding the prayer to imply sacramental (not *real*) eating only in the case of

¹ So the Puritan Prayer-Book of 1574 or 1575, which takes the name of Middleburgh (where a company of English merchants resided under the ministry of Cartwright, and where subsequent editions were published), directs the minister "to break the bread and deliver it to the people, saying, 'Take and eat: *this bread is the body* of Christ that was broken for us" (see Blakeney's "Common Prayer," p. 195; and Hall's "Frag-menta Liturgica," vol. i., pp. 9 and 65; and "Reliquiæ Liturgicæ," vol. i., p. 59; also Bancroft's "Dangerous Positions," pp. 95-97, London, 1591). And Baxter's Service gives these for the words of administration : "Take ye, eat ye; *this is the body* of Christ which is broken for you. Do this in remembrance of Him" (see Blakeney's "Common Prayer," p. 202; and Hall's "Reliquiæ Liturgicæ," vol. iv., p. 72).

² See Archdeacon Denison, "Three Sermons," p. 71; J. H. Blunt's "Common Prayer," p. 186, note; "Sequel to Kiss of Peace," p. 345, etc.

unbeneficial reception. The prayer might not unnaturally be paraphrased thus:¹ "Grant us to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son, not sacramentally only, receiving in our mouths the shadow and sign alone to our condemnation, but so really and in very truth, receiving by our faith and feeding in our hearts upon the very Thing signified," etc.

In order, however, completely to invalidate all the force of this argument, it will be sufficient, I think, to call attention to the fact that the separation in a sentence of "so" from "THAT" does *by no means of necessity*, in the language of our Prayer-Book (as is commonly the case in modern use), put that emphasis on the "so" which implies that the same thing *might be*, with different results.

For proof of this, let the reader be asked to mark carefully the use of the same form of expression in other parts of the Prayer-Book. He will find, I think, that if in the prayer before us it is held to prove that (according to the teaching of our service) it must be possible to receive the *res Sacramenti* unworthily, then, by the application of the very same argument, our Prayer-Book must be held to teach plainly that it must be possible—

(1) That our heavenly Father may *so* assist us by His grace that we may **NOT** "continue in that holy fellowship."

(2) That the ministers and stewards of Christ's mysteries may *so* prepare Christ's way, by turning the hearts of the disobedient to the wisdom of the just, that at His second coming we may **NOT** be found an acceptable people in His sight.

(3) That we may be *so* joined together in unity of spirit by the doctrine of Apostles and prophets as **NOT** to be made an holy temple acceptable unto God.

(4) That we may *so* follow God's blessed saints in all virtuous and godly living that we may **NOT** come to the joys which God hath prepared for them that unfeignedly love Him.

(5) That we may *so* faithfully serve God in this life that **WE MAY fail** to attain His everlasting promise.

(6) That God would *so* vouchsafe to send His blessing on His servants that they may **NOT** obey His will nor abide in His love.

¹ Compare the words of Cranmer: "that is to say, that we may *so* worthily receive the same, that we may be partakers of Christ's body and blood, and that therewith in spirit and in truth we may be spiritually nourished" ("On Lord's Supper," p. 79).

(7) That God would *so* turn His anger from us and make haste to help us that we may **NOT** live with Him in the world to come.

(8) That we may *so* be led in the knowledge and obedience of God's Word that in the end we may **NOT** obtain everlasting life.

These examples (viewed **NOT** *separately*, but **ALL together**) will suffice, I think, to show that, whether we like to regard the word "*so*" as emphatic or not (in this prayer), any argument as to doctrine built on so weak a foundation must fall to the ground.

I have spoken of such arguments as microscopical arguments. I trust, in speaking thus, and in using such illustrations as I have used, I may not seem to have been treating the matter in a way unseemly or unbecoming. It is with no desire to treat the arguments of the ritualists contemptuously that I have resorted to them. If any apology is considered due for what I have said, or the way I have said it, I trust such apology will be accepted with an assurance that I am very far from wishing to treat any of these arguments or their maintainers with levity or with any want of due courtesy. I gladly bear testimony to the ability with which those arguments have been supported, and the zeal which has been manifested in their defence. But still, the truth is the truth. And some such illustrations appear to me best capable of bringing out clearly into view what I cannot but regard as the truth in this matter. To some extent I shall be obliged myself to use the microscope in this paper. Possibly, to some minds really desirous to look at these things fairly, and to weigh them according to their true weight, some of these matters may seem to be more important than they have appeared to me, and I may be thought to have been making them too small and treating them too lightly. Possibly I may have erred in that direction, though I hope I have not desired to do so. But the point I wish to press is this: that for a true view of the testimony borne by this service to the matter before us we are called upon primarily to look round on the service "*in the length and the breadth of it.*" It must be allowed by all, I think, that such arguments as these are *comparatively* insignificant.

We have the broad field before us of our Church's "Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper." Surely here we should be as "*in a land flowing with milk and honey.*" And then we

are constrained to ask, Are we to be set to look for that which is regarded as the milk and honey hidden sparsely in such recondite recesses as these ?

No. But we will stand and look round, and ask our readers to look round with us, on the broad surface before us.

Let it not be taken amiss if I venture to express a conviction that this controversy only needs to be driven out of holes and corners and brought well out into the open.

Let us cease, then, from analysing phrases and expressions which surely were never meant to be analysed thus. Let us take a comprehensive view of the service in its grand features and its bold outline. And looking round let us ask, *Where*, here, are we to find this all-important teaching (in the view of some) of a Real Presence in the elements and of an oral reception ? Where is the teaching of reception by unbelievers ? Where is the doctrine of a sacrifice of Christ's present Body and Blood offered up in the elements, and so pleaded before the Father by the priest ? Where is the teaching of a Presence to be adored under the forms of bread and wine ?

Where are these teachings, these doctrines which we are to hold as *de fide* ?

Truly, if they are to be found anywhere, they must be found "under the microscope."

And what, then, about this absence—this absence of all that should give to our service the character and impress of the "Real Objective Presence" ?

Surely we may do right to inquire about it, and take note of the answer we receive—that this absence came of a CLEARING, and that the *date* of this CLEARING was the *date* of the REFORMATION, and that the *work* of this CLEARING was the *work* of the REFORMERS.

And shall we not do well also to note, what the history of our Church will tell us, that for such-like CLEARING work many perished at the stake, and gave their bodies to be burned, rather than put a hand to build up what thus they had destroyed ?

Yes. But we must do more. We must mark well that this CLEARING work of our Reformers was not directed only to the removal of the superstitions which clung to *transubstantiation*. Their axes and saws were not used only on such strong boughs of Popery as this. They were not satisfied with cutting down

the topmost branches of the trees. No. That which in the sight of those who hold the Real Objective Presence should be as the milk and honey of the goodly land, in the eyes of our Reformers was all as gall and wormwood. And their mattocks and pickaxes were at work *underground*. They were resolved, if possible, to leave NO ROOT that should bear such gall and wormwood.

And the history of the *clearing* which our Communion Service has seen is the history of an *uprooting*. It is the history of a work carried on in the spirit of him whom God appointed as the foreman in the work, and who took up his tools crying to his fellows : “The rest is but branches and leaves, the cutting away whereof is but like topping and lopping of a tree, or cutting down of weeds, leaving the body standing and the roots in the ground ; but the very body of the tree, or, rather, the roots of the weeds, is the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation, of the REAL PRESENCE of Christ’s Flesh and Blood in the sacrament of the altar (as they call it), and of the SACRIFICE and oblation of Christ *made by the priest* for the salvation of the quick and the dead. Which roots, if they be suffered to grow in the Lord’s vineyard, they will overspread all the ground again with the old errors and superstitions. These injuries to Christ be so intolerable that no Christian heart can willingly bear them ” (Preface to “Lord’s Supper,” 1550).

It was with such words as these, and in such a spirit as this, that Archbishop Cranmer set to “his hand and his axe with the rest ” at the great CLEARING work which was before them.

And the result of such a determination, such a settled purpose to leave *no root* that might spring up and bear the gall and wormwood of a “Real Objective Presence” and its concomitant doctrines, is seen in the matters of difference between the first and second Prayer-Books of Edward VI. The first Prayer-Book, indeed, was quite capable of being used without offence. In it all that could be said even to look like transubstantiation has been lopped off, the sacrificial character was maimed, and the adoration was gone, and there was nothing on the surface that must needs have seemed evil, if only it were interpreted according to the sense of the Articles subsequently published. But, like the phrase in the notice at the end of the first book of Homilies, there was something in it which might seem at least to have something of a *sound*, or perhaps something of *flavour*, of a “Real Presence” in a Lutheran sense. There were ROOTS. And before

the spirit which animated Cranmer and his associates, the roots must be rooted up. They could not rest satisfied till they had applied axe and hand to a more thorough CLEARING. These causes of offence must be removed. In that new CLEARING there must be a more thorough *uprooting*. And axes and hands went to work again, not, indeed, with intemperate precipitancy, not with fanatical disregard of ancient landmarks, not without the wisdom and prudence and caution of well-learned and able divines,¹ not at all in the spirit of those who, for no sufficient cause, would prefer that which comes new from their own pen to those sacred and time-honoured heritages of the Christian Church,² which, having been received from the times of purer faith, might well be cleansed from the superstitions and corruptions with which after-ages had encrusted them ; but still, not the less, yea, rather all the more, and all the more notably, with steadfast and deliberate resolution, they went to work, with earnest and settled purpose, to clear away whatever remained in our Communion Service that might give reasonable cause for offence, or occasion for the planting and growing and spreading of superstitious practices or dangerous doctrines. And as the result we have now an order for the administration of the Lord's Supper, in which it requires a microscope to discover the root of a weed left behind.

No doubt it may be alleged (and few, I imagine, will dispute it) that in Cranmer's mild and gentle disposition there was that, the tendency of which was sometimes to make his policy seem feeble rather than firm, hesitating rather than decided, slow and cautious rather than vigorous.³

No doubt it may be urged that there were those at the time (and there have been some such ever since) who were dissatisfied with the result, and regarded Cranmer and his associates as being even weak and half-hearted in their work of Reformation. But was Cranmer ever accused by such of leaving in our Liturgy any roots of the doctrine of the Real Corporal Presence ? If not,

¹ See Hook's "Lives of Archbishops," Series ii., vol. ii., pp. 225, 226, 268, *sqq.*

² "Sudden changes without substantial necessary causes, and the heady setting forth of extremities, we did never love" (Ridley, as quoted by Dean Hook in "The Church and the Age," p. 29).

³ See Hallam's "Constitutional History," vol. i., p. 99; edit. 1867.

does not the very slowness and caution and moderation of the Reformers of our Liturgy make all the more evident and conspicuous the purpose and resolution which, in this matter at least, made their action to be vigorous and their work to be thorough? In this particular, certainly, Cranmer's convictions were strong, and his hand was not feeble, and his purpose was steadfast, and his spirit was resolute, and his mind knew no indecision.

Cranmer and his associates may have been slow in casting off the faith of a Corporal Presence. But having, after much consideration, deliberately repudiated it at last, they were thoroughly and heartily in earnest in the work of uprooting it.

Cranmer was not always irresolute.¹ And of the doctrine of the Eucharist it may be said, here his strength lay. In this matter, when (after the most careful investigation) his long-cherished views of the Presence had quite given way, when he had made up his mind, and put on his armour, then he came forth as a champion, with an invincible energy and power and determination such as could not but win the admiration even of some who had been disposed to mistrust him. And then, with no hesitating and wavering mind, with no faint and feeble purpose (we may be sure), he took his place²—the foremost place—among those who, with minds not less earnest in the work than his own, sat down to revise and make perfect the Communion Service of the Church of England ("Papers on the Eucharistic Presence," pp. 432-445).

IV. But another argument is derived from the use of the term "mysteries." And this argument no doubt acquires force from popular

¹ See Hook's "Lives," Series ii., vol. ii., pp. 23, 24, 88, 174, 303, 304, 363, 376.

² No doubt there may have been on the commission men with tempers, on the whole, less conservative than Cranmer's; and it is quite possible that Cranmer may have exercised, to some extent, a restraining influence. But I can hardly conceive it possible that any unprejudiced mind, acquainted with Cranmer's writings, can doubt for a moment that Cranmer's own mind was fully and thoroughly in accord with, and went heartily and earnestly to work with, the *animus* which resolved on, initiated, guided, and effected the changes in Edward's second book (see Cardwell's "Two Liturgies," Preface, pp. 29, 30, 35). And the same, I feel persuaded, would be true of Ridley also.

misunderstandings. Indeed, it will be found, perhaps, to be no very uncommon thing for people to justify their maintaining of contradictions by pleading that what they have to believe concerning the Eucharist is confessedly an incomprehensible mystery.

I therefore venture to append another quotation from the same paper.

The word "mysteries" here seems to be so often misunderstood (almost as if it must be the nature of a "mystery" to mystify; see Burgess, "Reformed Church of England," p. 150) that it may be well to give one or two quotations which may help to clear its true meaning. "Sacraments are called mysteries because in a dark speech they hide other things which are more holy. And Paul willingly useth this word in his Epistles. And why this word was attributed to the holy signs of the Christian Church there is a plain reason; for these things are only known to the faithful, and are hid from those that are profane and unholy. And surely the preaching of the Gospel itself is called 'the mystery of the kingdom of God' to teach us that, the unclean being shut out, it is revealed to the only children of God" (Bullinger's "Decades," v., 237).

"It is called a mystery, or a holy secrecy, for that our eye beholdeth one thing and our faith another" (Jewel, "Sermon and Harding," p. 515).

"Two . . . because what is intended by them [the Sacraments] is not immediately discernible by what is done without some explication (their significance being not wholly grounded in the nature, but depending upon arbitrary institution, as that of words, which is of kin to them; whence St. Austin calls a Sacrament *verbum visible*), have usually been called mysteries (that is, actions of a close and occult importance, of deeper meaning and design, than is obvious to ordinary perception), and thence are also called Sacraments" (Barrow, Works, 1683, vol. i., p. 542. See Professor Hey's "Lectures," vol. ii., p. 490).

"The word *mystery*, as used by St. Paul, signifies something kept *secret* and hidden, and generally something *sacred* and *divine*, which cannot be discovered by natural reason, but is *UNFOLDED* by Divine revelation" (Wordsworth on Ephes. v. 32).

"μυστήριον, either from Gr. μύω, to shut, or from Heb. (mistar), from root (sathar), to hide; hence something which is involved, or concealed, or symbolized by something external, as the soul in

the body—a *sacramentum*” (Wordsworth on Matt. xiii. 11. See Malan’s “Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper,” note, p. 5).

“A most unscriptural and dangerous sense is but too often put upon this word, as if it meant something absolutely unintelligible and incomprehensible. A strange mistake, since in almost every text wherein *μνηστήριον* is used it is mentioned as something which is *revealed, declared, shown, spoken, or which may be known or understood*” (Parkhurst’s Lexicon, *in voc.* See Whitaker’s “Disputation,” P.S. Edit., p. 252).

No doctrinal argument, then, it seems to me, in favour of the Real Objective Presence can be built upon this word (see Freeman’s “Principles of Divine Service,” vol. ii., part 1, p. 18, *sqq.*; S. C. Malan, “On Ritualism,” pp. 68-71; Bingham’s “Antiquities,” Book X., chap. v., vol. iii., pp. 379, 380).

Beza, indeed (who constantly, like Calvin, applies the word “mystery” to the Eucharist), from this word makes an argument which tells powerfully against the Real Objective Presence. He says: “Sæpe sum miratus fieri potuisse ut in Sacramentaria institutione explicanda, in qua constat figurata,¹ pleraque dici, quoniam hæc est *μνηστηρίων* natura, nonnulli omnia ut propriè dicta acciperent” (“Tract. Theol.,” vol. ii., p. 188. Geneva, 1582).

Indeed, the expression “high mysteries” is used in the Middleburgh Prayer-Book, which had the sanction of Cartwright and the approval of Calvin, and was but a compilation from the Genevan form. It contains the following passage: “We do first,

¹ So Bertram or Rathram says: “If there be no figure in that mystery, it is not properly called a mystery” (“Concerning the Body and Blood of Jesus,” p. 147; edit. Dublin, 1753. See also pp. 150, 171, 174, 175-181, 182, 191).

“Hoc sensu Sacraenta dicta sunt *mysteria* in Græca Ecclesia, quia ipsa quidem sunt res externæ et sensibus obviæ, sed eorum significatio arcana est, et non nisi ex verbo Dei cognosci potest” (Ursinus, in Works, vol. ii., p. 1381; edit. Reuter, 1612).

“Apud Theologos posteriores immutata fuit hujus nominis ratio, ac appellarunt Sacramentum signum illud sensibile. sub quo latet arcanum spirituale: arcanum vero id quod latet appellavere rem Sacramenti” (Gaspar Contarini, Works, p. 331, Paris, 1571). See also L’Arroque’s “History of the Eucharist,” Walker’s Translation, 1684, pp. 257-260; and Chamier’s “Panstrat. Cathol.,” tom. iv., p. 5, 1627.

therefore, examine ourselves, according to St. Paul's rule, and prepare our minds, that we may be worthy partakers of so *high mysteries*." See Blakeney, "Common Prayer," pp. 191 and 438, note, who quotes from Bingham: "There is nothing more usual with the ancients than this way of speaking, to call every sacred rite and ceremony used in the Church by the name of sacrament or mystery." Thus, as Dr. Blakeney observes, "the word *Mυστήριον* signifies not only a thing hidden until revealed, but a *similitude*."

In answer to the argument that "the presence of our Saviour in the Eucharist" is confessed by English divines "an ineffable mystery," Archbishop Wake replies thus: "Well, be it so; what will he hence infer? Why, 'this he conceives is said to be so in respect of something in it OPPOSITE AND CONTRADICTORY TO, and therefore incomprehensible and ineffable by human reason.' But supposing they should *not* think it so from being *opposite AND CONTRADICTORY to*, but because the manner how Christ herein communicates Himself to us is hid from and above our human reason, might not this be sufficient to make it still be called an ineffable and incomprehensible mystery? Whereas the other would make it rather PLAIN AND COMPREHENSIBLE NONSENSE. It is a *strange affection* that some men have got of late for CONTRADICTIONS; they are so in love with them that they have *almost brought it to be the definition of a mystery*, to be the revelation of *something to be believed IN OPPOSITION TO SENSE AND REASON*" (Archbishop Wake in Gibson's "Preservative," vol. x., p. 80).

Of the Romish doctrine and its defence, Archbishop Secker says: "They must not say this doctrine is a mystery. For there is no mystery, no obscurity, in it; but it is as plainly seen to be an error as anything else is seen to be a truth. And the more so because it relates, not to an infinite Nature, as God, but entirely to what is finite, a bit of bread and a human body" ("Lectures on Catechism," vol. ii., p. 246; edit. 1769).

"Is it not the case . . . that 'holy mysteries' did *not* mean holy concealments, but *showings forth*?" (Present Day Papers, "The Eucharist," p. 14). "I am afraid a spirit is abroad to which there can be no greater recommendation of any doctrine than that it shocks the common-sense of mankind. . . . It must be remembered that in the present case the objection to the alleged *mystery*

is, not that it is inscrutable, but that it is factitious, a creature of human speculation, the product of an arbitrary and fanciful exegesis, disguised by an accumulation of unmeaning and mutually contradictory terms" (Bishop of St. David's Charge, 1869, p. 67. See also S. C. Malan, "On Ritualism," p. 99; and Turton, "On Eucharist," pp. 221, 222).

It must not be supposed that thus there is eliminated from "these holy mysteries" that which is really hidden and secret and passing man's understanding in the sacramental efficacy and the Divine operation for the souls of the faithful through the faith of the Gospel (see Goulburn, "On Holy Communion," pp. 288-290; Bishop Bilson, "True Difference," pp. 806, 807).

Hosipian says: "Quinam fieri possit ut Christi carnem in cœlis nunc positam nos in terris positi, quamvis spiritualiter, vere tamen per fidem participemus, ut vivificum illud succum inde hauriamus, hoc captum nostrum superat et mysterium magnum est" ("Concordia Discors." in Works, vol. v., p. 46b). The same view is frequently expressed by Calvin.

So Beza says: "Etsi enim scimus Spiritum Sanctum, id est, Dei virtutem hoc operari, et quod ad nos attinet, solo fidei instrumento id omne a nobis percipi, tamen et Spiritus potentia, et fidei efficacia nostrum omnem sensum exuperant: quo fit ut tota hæc actio valde propriè *μνστήριον* vocetur" ("Tract. Theol.," vol. i., p. 209. See also Beza as quoted above, Paper No. VI., p. 357; and Bishop Bayly's "Practice of Piety," p. 445, edit. 1668; "Papers on the Eucharistic Presence," pp. 522-525).

NOTE B.

See page 49.

SINCE it is important to note that there was good cause for the change of expression in the Black Rubric, I have thought it worth while here to set before the reader the greater part of the note referred to in the text.

When Dr. Pusey says, "Plainly, the word 'corporal,' which they admitted, could not in their minds mean the same as 'real and essential,' which they rejected" ("Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church," p. 224; see also "Sequel to Kiss of Peace," p. 321; and Grueler's "Reply to Dr. Heurtley," p. 330, *sqq.*; and Bishop Forbes on Articles, ii., p. 547), he seems to have overlooked the fact that, the two phrases having been often used as *convertible*, there might be very good reason for preferring to express the *same thing* in language which our divines *never* claimed as their own rather than in language which, as applied to Eucharistic reception, many eminent divines *had claimed* for ourselves and for the doctrine of our Reformed Church.

That the change from "real and essential" to "corporal presence" was not without sufficient cause will be apparent, I think, to all who will observe—

(1) That in the earlier period of the English Reformed Church the expression "Real Presence," unexplained, was commonly rejected by our Reformers, and regarded as expressing the Romish doctrine, though doubtless with explanation it was sometimes accepted by them. The following examples may be taken in proof of this:

Cranmer speaks of "the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation, of the *Real Presence*" ("On Lord's Supper," p. 6). And again he says: "Not long before I wrote the said Catechism I was in that error of the *Real Presence*" (*Ibid.*, p. 374).

Ridley says: "The blood is in the chalice indeed, but NOT IN THE REAL PRESENCE, but by grace and in a sacrament" (Works, p. 238).

Jewel argues at length against "the Real Presence," and speaks of "these NEW-FANGLED WORDS, 'really,' 'corporally,' 'carnally,' etc. Which words M. Harding is not able to show that, in this case of BEING REALLY in the Sacrament, any one of all the old fathers ever used" ("Sermon and Harding," p. 449).

So Foxe, speaking of the difference between the Lutherans and the Sacramentaries, says: "They both . . . do confess the Presence of Christ, and disagree only upon the manner of the Presence, which the one part do affirm to be *real*, and the other *spiritual*" ("Acts and Monuments," vol. v., p. 11).

Hence in the 29th Article of 1553 we have "real and corporal" coupled as expressive of the doctrine rejected: "A faithful man ought not either to believe or openly to confess the real and bodily (*realem et corporalem*) Presence (as they term it) of Christ's flesh and blood."

(2) That when, in the earlier period of the English Reformed Church, the expression "Real Presence" or "Real Essential Presence" was accepted, it was always accepted with explanation, and that in that explanation the "corporal" or "bodily" or "carnal" Presence was commonly excluded.

It is true, indeed, that in 1555 Bradford accepted the words "corporally present" with explanation ("Sermons," etc., p. 480), and that Dean Aldrich acknowledges the words as capable of being used in a sound sense (quoted in Goode, "On Eucharist," i., p. 39). But the example must be regarded as exceptional, and unsupported by the use of succeeding divines.

Thus Ridley, accepting "A REAL PRESENCE" (p. 213), explains that if meant of "the real and CORPORAL substance," THAT Presence "cannot be on the earth," and (p. 236) denies that it is "by the CORPORAL Presence of the Body of His flesh." But (p. 274) he acknowledges the Presence, "vere et realiter," for "SPIRITUALLY, by grace and efficacy." Again, he speaks of "A SPIRITUAL Presence by grace, and not after any CORPORAL SUBSTANCE of His flesh taken of the Virgin Mary" (p. 249).

Thus Latimer acknowledges "none other Presence than a SPIRITUAL Presence," but adds, "The same may be called a Real Presence" ("Remains," p. 252).

Thus Philpot acknowledges "a very ESSENTIAL Presence," yea, "a REAL Presence" (p. 130), but denies the being present "bodily" (p. 208).

Thus Hooper acknowledges: "Christum . . . adesse . . . quoad corporis ejus gratiam, sed NON quoad corporis ejus SUBSTANTIAM" ("Later Writings," p. 394).

Thus Haddon: "Corpus Christi REALITER adest Sacramentis corporis et sanguinis sui vere ex Christi institutione administratis. Intellige REALITER pro vere et non ficte, sacramentaliter NON autem CARNALITER" (Haddon's "Opinion of the Presence," 1553; given in Collier's "Eccles. History," vol. ix., 301).

Thus Hooker: "They [the ancient Fathers] teach that Christ is PERSONALLY there PRESENT—yea, *present whole*, albeit a part of Christ be CORPORALLY ABSENT from thence" (Keble Edit., vol. ii., p. 357).

(3) That when subsequent English divines claimed and appropriated the phrase "Real Presence" as expressing the doctrine of our Church, they did not thus claim and appropriate the phrase "Corporal Presence," which was thus left to express that doctrine of the opponents which had at an earlier period been expressed by the phrase "Real Presence."

Thus Jeremy Taylor, in his treatise on "The Real Presence," says: "I suppose we do in no sense prevaricate this so pious and prudent counsel by saying THE PRESENCE OF CHRIST IS REAL AND SPIRITUAL." (The capitals are his own. Sec. i., 2.) And though he acknowledges that the word "corporally" may become "warrantable and consonant to our doctrine," yet he says (Sec. i., 9): "That which seems of hardest explication is the word *corporaliter*, which I find that Melanchthon used, saying, *Corporaliter quoque communicatione carnis Christi Christum in nobis habitare*; which manner of speaking I have heard he avoided after he had conversed with Ecolampadius, who was able then to teach him and most men in that question" (see Archbishop Wake in Gibson's "Preservative," vol. x., p. 70).

So Bishop Morton, while maintaining, like Taylor, "the Real Presence," devotes the fourth book of his work on the Eucharist to "the Corporal Presence," the title of which is, "Treating of the Second Romish Consequence, arising from the False Exposition of these words of Christ [“This is My Body”] called CORPORAL PRESENCE in the Sacrament of the Eucharist." And the

second section of the first chapter is headed thus: "That Protestants, albeit they *deny the CORPORAL PRESENCE of Christ* in this Sacrament, yet hold they a *TRUE Presence* thereof in divers respects, according to the judgment of antiquity."

Bishop Andrewes says: "Præsentiam (inquam) credimus, nec minus quam vos, veram. De modo præsentiaæ nil temere definimus; non magis quam, in baptismo nostro, quomodo abluat nos sanguis Christi" ("Responsio ad Bellarm.", p. 13).

On which words Archbishop Wake has said: "He [Andrewes] plainly insinuates that the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist was much the same as in baptism, the very allusion which the holy fathers were wont to make to express His Presence by in this holy Sacrament; which, since our adversaries can neither deny nor yet say is *so real* as to be *essential or CORPOREAL*, they must of necessity allow that there may be a true Presence (which is all the Bishop affirms) without such a substantial one as this author here contends for" (Archbishop Wake's "Discourse of the Holy Eucharist," in Gibson's "Preservative," vol. x., p. 69; see also pp. 70, 71).

L'Estrange speaks of "that *REAL Presence* which all sound Protestants seem to allow" ("Alliance of Divine Offices," Edit. Oxford, p. 323). But the phrase *CORPORAL Presence* was distinctly disallowed by Archbishop Laud (see Bulley's "Variations," p. 184).

Hammond says: "Bestowing that Body and Blood of Christ upon us . . . *REALLY*" (Hammond's "Practical Catechism," p. 129). "The faithful do receive the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament, which implies not any *CORPORAL PRESENCE* of Christ on the table or in the elements, but God's communicating the crucified Saviour (who is in heaven bodily, and nowhere else) to us sinners on the earth" (*Ibid.*, p. 126).

In like manner Archbishop Laud ("Conference with Fisher," p. 247) says: "PROTESTANTS OF ALL SORTS maintain a *true and REAL presence* of Christ in the Eucharist." But the Seventh English Canon of 1640 disclaims "any opinion of a *CORPORAL Presence* of the Body of Jesus Christ on the holy table or in mystical elements" (Cardwell's "Synodalia," vol. i., p. 406).

Again, Archbishop Laud quotes with approval the words of Cranmer: "If you understand by this word *REALLY re ipsa*—that is, in *very deed and effectually*—so Christ, by the grace and *efficacy*

of His Passion, is indeed and truly PRESENT, etc. But if by this word *really* you understand CORPORALITER, CORPORALLY in His natural and organisical body, under the forms of bread and wine, it is CONTRARY TO THE HOLY WORD OF GOD" ("Conference with Fisher," p. 248).

Heylin gives it as the ground for the omission of this rubric (as well as for the change in the form of administration) in Elizabeth's reign, "lest, under colour of rejecting a *carnal*, they might be thought also to deny such a *Real Presence* as was defended in the writings of the ancient fathers" ("History of Reformation," E.H.S. Edit., pp. 285, 286).

So John Owen says: "One of the greatest engines that ever the devil made use of to overthrow the faith of the Church was by forging such a *presence of Christ* as is not truly in this ordinance, to drive us off from looking after that *great Presence* which is TRUE. I look upon it as one of the greatest engines that ever hell set on work. It is NOT a *corporeal presence*. Everything that is in sense, reason, and the faith of a man overthrows that *corporeal presence*" (Works, Edit. Goold, vol. ix., p. 572). Yet Owen speaks of Christ as "REALLY exhibited" and "REALLY communicated" (p. 617), and "the reception . . . REALLY" (p. 621).

(4) Add to this that the phrase "CORPORAL PRESENCE" was accepted and pleaded for by Lutherans as expressing the doctrine which was held in common by themselves, the Roman Church, and the Greek Church (see quotations in Goode "On Eucharist," ii., p. 624), but not by the Reformed, who yet did not reject the phrase "Real Presence."

Ursinus says: "Isthæc præsentia ac perceptio tum corporis tum sanguinis Domini, tametsi spiritualis NON corporalis, nec oralis est; essentialis tamen ac vera est" ("Solida Refutatio Cavillationum Theol. Wirtem.," in Works, vol. ii., p. 363. Edit. Reuter, Heidelberg, 1612). Again: "Confitendo VERAM præsentiam . . . multum abest, ut corporalem, oralem . . . confiteri quis præsumatur" (*Ibid.*, p. 367).

The "Declaratio Thoruniensis" also (1645) in like manner clearly confesses a most *real*, while distinctly denying a *corporeal*, Presence. It says: "Nequaquam etiam negamus veram Corporis et Sanguinis Christi in Cœna Præsentiam, sed tantum localem et corporalem Modum, et Unionem cum Elementis substantialem: ipsam vero nobiscum Præsentiam sancte Credimus, et quidem

non imaginariam, sed verissimam, *realissimam et efficacissimam*" (in Niemeyer's "Collectio Confessionum," p. 682. See above, § 7).

"All," says D'Aubigné, concluding the account of the conference at Marburg—"Romanists and Evangelicals, Saxons and Swiss—admitted the Presence, and even the REAL PRESENCE of, Christ" ("History of the Reformation," p. 346). But in the preceding page we have Luther's words, declaring: "We are not agreed on the subject whether the real Body and Blood of Christ are CORPOREALLY present in the bread and wine" (see Edgar's "Variations of Popery," p. 7; and especially Hospinian, vol. iv., pp. 128, 129).

The "Consensus Orthodoxus" of Herdesian speaks of the calumny against the Reformed: "Quod veram Christi in cœna præsentiam negent, quasi non aliter quam per corporalem carnis præsentiam, sacramentis suis vere adesse possit Christus" (Edit. 1605, p. 255). Again: Etsi præsentia Christi non sit corporalis, recte tamen dici potest esse *realis*" (*Ibid.*, p. 259).

In the Westminster Confession of Faith it is said: "The Body and Blood of Christ being, then, NOT CORPORALLY or carnally in, with, or under the bread and wine, yet as REALLY, but spiritually, PRESENT to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as elements themselves are to their outward senses" (Edit. 1658, p. 100).

(5) Add yet the following statements from men¹ who were themselves engaged in the last review of the Prayer-Book, at which the Black Rubric was restored.

"We teach also a REAL PRESENCE of Christ's Body . . . by the means of the *real operation and effectual efficacy of GRACE*" (Sheldon, Bp. London, quoted in Garbett's "Voices of the Church of England," p. 54).

"It is not the taking of Christ's Body into our mouths, in the very flesh or CORPOREAL substance of it (if it could be so taken) that can nourish us spiritually . . . but it is the *Spirit*, saith Christ, that quickeneth, that is, it is the SPIRITUAL eating of His

¹ Sheldon and Morley and Reynolds had previously been on the Savoy Commission. Morley and Nicholson were on the Commission appointed by the Upper House of Convocation to prepare the book for revision (see Cardwell's "Conferences," pp. 370, 371). This committee, however, appears to have been almost superseded by the action of Convocation itself (see Cardwell, p. 371).

flesh and drinking of His blood, that nourisheth us" (Bishop Morley of Worcester, quoted in Garbett's "Voices of the Church of England," p. 53).

Bishop Reynolds (the writer, probably, of our General Thanksgiving; see Cardwell's "Conf.," p. 372), affirming it to be "both absurd and impious" to affirm Christ "really and **CORPORALLY** present with the consecrated elements, severed from the act of faithful receiving," yet declares: "A *REAL presence* of Christ we acknowledge, but not local or physical; for *presence REAL* (that being a metaphysical term) is not opposed unto a mere physical or local absence or distance, but is opposed to a false, imaginary, fantastic presence;" adding, "What presence fitter for a spiritual union than a *SPIRITUAL presence*?" ("Meditations on the Holy Sacrament," in Works, Edit. 1826, vol. iii., pp. 69, 72, 73).

Bishop Nicholson says: "This presence of His is **REAL** . . . for He is **TRULY** and **EFFECTUALLY** there present, though **NOT CORPORALLY, BODILY, carnally, locally**" (Nicholson, Bp. Gloucester, "Exposition of Catechism," p. 217).

The following testimonies may be added, as showing that the distinction was preserved by succeeding divines: "This **REAL PRESENCE** of Christ in the sacrament His Church hath always believed. But the monstrous notion of His **BODILY PRESENCE** was started seven hundred years after His death" (Archbishop Secker, quoted in Goode, "On Eucharist," ii., p. 724).

"The Body and Blood of Christ are taken and received by the faithful, not substantially, not **CORPORALLY**, but verily and indeed, that is, effectually. The sacred symbols are no bare signs, no untrue figures of a thing absent; but the force, the grace, the virtue, and benefit of Christ's Body broken and Blood shed—that is, of His passion—are really and effectually present with all them that receive worthily. This is all the **REAL Presence** that our Church teaches" (Waterland, vol. iv., p. 42).

Much more evidence of the same kind might be adduced, but more seems to be needless.

At a time when the phrase "Real Presence" had come to signify a doctrine which was acknowledged to be held by *Protestants generally* (see Paper No. VI., p. 371), even those most opposed to anything like the Real Objective Presence; at a time when "the **Corporal Presence**" was commonly understood to be the designation of the doctrine of Papists and Lutherans, it were

strange indeed if the change made in the “Declaration” were to be regarded as unaccountable save on the supposition of its being no longer condemnatory of the doctrine taught by Papists and Lutherans.

I add the following valuable observation of Dean Goode: “One great point for which our divines have contended, in opposition to Romish errors, has been the reality of that Presence of Christ’s Body and Blood to the soul of the believer which is effected through the operation of the Holy Spirit, notwithstanding the absence of the substance of that Body and Blood in heaven. Like the sun, the Body of Christ is both present and absent: present, really and truly present, in one sense—that is, by the soul being brought into immediate communion with—but absent in another sense—that is, as regards the contiguity of its substance to our bodies. The authors under review, like the Romanists, maintain that this is not a Real Presence, and, assuming their own interpretation of the phrase to be the only true one, press into their service the testimony of divines who, though using the phrase, apply it in a sense the reverse of theirs. The ambiguity of the phrase, and its misapplication by the Church of Rome, have induced many of our divines to repudiate it, and our Church, as Dean Aldrich has observed, has wisely forborne its use; but others, for the similar purpose of preventing misconception and meeting the misrepresentations of the Romanists, have maintained and contended for its use. The real doctrine of our divines, therefore, is not to be sought in their use or rejection of this phrase, but in the meaning they attach to it, and their accompanying statements” (Goode, “On Eucharist,” ii., p. 757. See Archbishop Wake in Gibson’s “Preservative,” vol. x., chap. ii.).

Understanding, then, the words “Real Presence” in that sense in which our English divines have accepted it, and which stands clearly distinguished from the modern “Real Objective Presence,” we may acknowledge as true what has been said concerning the final revisers, that “they retained the protest against Transubstantiation, while they removed all risk of the Declaration, or ‘Black Rubric’ as it was sometimes called, being understood as even an *apparent* denial of the truth of the Real Presence” (see J. H. Blunt’s “Common Prayer,” p. 199, note).

But then it must not be supposed that such a Real Presence had ever been denied or called in question by our Reformers.

The following words will show the views of a Roman Catholic concerning the Black Rubric : “ Mr. Cobb believes in the Real Presence of our Lord under the species ; but how can he refrain from adoration ? How can he say that the adoration would be idolatry ? If the substance of the bread and wine be changed, and nothing remain but ‘the natural properties,’ and if he believe that our Lord is there, why does he not confess His Presence by the outward and natural act of adoration ? If it be replied that adoration is refused to the ‘bread and wine,’ that is, to the ‘accidents’ which remain, nothing further need be said ; and we must be content with observing that nobody ever thought of adoring the accidents. . . . Now, the ‘Black Rubric’ says that no adoration ‘ought to be done’ either to the Host ‘or unto any corporal presence of Christ’s natural Flesh and Blood.’ The reason given for this refusal is that the ‘bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances,’ and that ‘the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here’ ” (*Dublin Review*, January, 1869, p. 247).

After all that can be pleaded to the contrary, it is scarcely possible to question that the Rubric has reference to the doctrine of the Church of Rome, and is intended to defend the Church of England from all *approaches* to that doctrine. Who ever laid it to the charge of the Church of England, that in bidding her children to receive the Communion on their knees she was leading them into peril of idolatry and false doctrine far beyond anything which was taught or practised in the Church of Rome ?

Compare the following from Crakanthorpe : “ *Vos de praesentia Christi CORPORALI in Eucharistia certissimi* ; cum neque ex Scripturis, neque testimonio prisorum Patrum, neque sensu, neque Ratione certi sitis, sed vanam solūm, ineptam, et impossibilem de hoc *opinionem* fovetis, et ut Idolum vestrorum cordium colitis. . . . *Præsentiam, inquis, hanc REALEM et CORPORALEM Christi nos supponimus . . . vos falsum supponitis. Ex FALSO supposito, FALSA religio, falsus et idolatricus cultus, falsum quodvis consequi potest. . . . Ex falso hoc supposito, hostiam adoratis, et adorandam dicitis* ” (Crakanthorpe, “ *Defensio Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, Lond. 1625,” Anglo-Cath. Libra Edit., pp. 474-476).

But the Church of Rome does not mean by *corporal presence* a gross material presence, not a *sensible, tangible* presence, "but either," as in Dean Goode's view, "precisely that sort of presence which is imagined by the authors under review" (see Goode, "On Eucharist," ii., p. 623, and Pusey's "Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church," pp. 323, 324; also, "Is Healthful Reunion Impossible?" pp. 87, 88. See also the Bishop of St. David's Charge, 1869, pp. 111, 112); or, at all events, one which differs from it in no way which (so far as I can see) can at all materially affect this question of adoration ("Papers on the Eucharistic Presence," pp. 572, 573, 578-586).

INDEX.

ABBOTT, PROFESSOR, 25, 91, 103
Ab Ulmis, John, 16
Act of Uniformity, 83, 97
Administration, Words of, 112
A Lasco, John, xiii, 22, 39
Aldrich, Dean, 22, 48, 49, 54, 55, 125, 131
Altar, 26, 27, 65, 102, 103, 104
Ambrosian Liturgy, 66
Ambrosian rite, 59
American Episcopal Church, 89
Amyraldus, Moses, xxiii
'Ανάμνησις, 25, 91
Andrewes, Bishop, xiv, xviii, xxv, xxxiii, 49, 54, 55, 64, 65, 127
Apology of the Church of England, xvii, xxviii
Aquinas, Thomas, 82
Armenian rite, 59
Articles, the Thirty-nine, xxvii, xxviii, 4, 47, 75, 125
Augsburg Confession, the, viii, xii, xxvi
Augusti, "Corpus Librorum symbolicorum, xxvii
Ayerst, 30
Aylmer, Bishop, xii
Bancroft, Archbishop, xvii, 113
Baptismal Service of 1549, 19
Barlow, Bishop, 58
Barrow, Dr. Isaac, 120
Barwick, 46
Baxter, R., 44, 46, 56, 57, 59, 60, 65, 69, 109
Bayly, Bishop, 123
Belgic Confession, xxix
Bellarmino, xxv, 43
Benedict XIV., 66, 73
Bennett Case, the, 48, 51
Bertram, 121
Beza, xiii, 121, 123
Bickell, 94
Bilson, Bishop, 123
Bingham, 122
Black Rubric. *See* Rubric
Blakeneys on "Common Prayer," 37, 54, 60, 113, 122
Blunt, Rev. J. H., 113, 131
Bowing at the Name of Jesus, 65
Bradford, 125
Brandenburg-Nürnberg Order, 21, 28
Brentius, xxvi
Brewer, "State Papers," 20
Bucer, "Scripta Anglicana," 5, 8, 9, 20, 61, 62, 67; "De Regno Christi," 15
Bulley, "Variations," 11, 37, 89, 127
Bullinger, x, xi, xiii, xviii, xxxii, 8, 16, 60, 67, 120
Burbidge, "Liturgeries and Offices," 19, 20, 22, 61, 62, 92
Burgess, 120
Burgon, Dean, 78
Burnet, "History of Reformation," xii, "History of his own Time," 37, 43, 44
Burton, 10
Cajetan, 80, 81
Calvin, x, xviii, xxviii, 42, 121, 123
Canon VII., xxi; LVII., vii; LXXIX., xviii
Canons of 1640, xxi, 127
Cardwell, "Liturgeries," 3, 22, 23, 24; "Documentary Annals," xii, xxi; "Synodalia," xxi; "Conferences," 37, 38, 47, 57, 59, 63, 65, 130
Carleton, Bishop, xiv, xxix
Cartwright, viii, 121
Casaubon, xxix, xxxi

Cassander, 59, 84, 94
 Catechism of Edward VI., xviii; of Nowell, xviii; Calvin, xviii; *Æcolampadius*, xviii; Leo Judæ, xviii
 Catharinus, 82
 Cecil, xxxii, 38, 40
 Chamier, 121
 Chasuble, 27, 28
 Chemnitz, 81
 Cheney, Bishop, xxxii
 Church and the World, 95
Church Intelligencer, 13, 14, 28
Churchman, v, 20
 Church Militant, Prayer for, 61
Church Quarterly Review, 23, 28, 39, 40, 81
 Clarendon, Lord, 45, 69
 Clemens Romanus, 61
 Clementine Liturgy, 94
 Collier, "Eccles. Hist.", 22, 38, 56, 79, 126
 Consensus Orthodoxus, 129
 Consensus Tigurinus, 30
 Contarini, 80, 121
 Corporal Presence, xxi, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51
 Cosin, Bishop, xxix, 20, 37, 42, 45, 46, 49, 95
 Council, Order of, concerning altars, 26
 Crakanthorpe, xxi, 132
 Cranmer, Archbishop, 3, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 28, 34, 39, 50, 86, 111, 114, 118, 119, 124
 Cranmer, "Cat.", 103
 "Cyprianus Anglicus," xx
 Dalton, Dr., 39
 Danæus, xiii
 Dasent, 10
 Davenant, Bishop, xxvi
 Davis, Rev. C. H., 66
 D'Aubigné, 129
 Day, Bishop, 12
 Dead, Prayers for, 24, 61
 "Declaratio Thoruniensis," 128
 Denison, Archdeacon, 113
 Denmark, Church of, 27
 "Dictionary of Christian Antiquities," 60
 "Directory," 59
 Dixon, "Hist. of Ch. of Eng.," 31, 33, 59, 61, 92
 Documents on Act of Uniformity, 47, 62
 Dort, Synod of, xxviii
 Dowden, Bishop, 20
 Downes, 17
 Droop, 19
 Dryander, 15
Dublin Review, 132
 Dugdale, "Life of Geste," 20, 38, 40
 Duke of Savoy, xxi
 Duport, Greek version of Prayer-Book, 58
 Durandus, xxix, 28
 Durel, 56, 58
 Earle, 46
 Eastward position, 27, 28
 Edgar, 129
 Edward VI., his first book, 2, 6, 25, 27, 29, 40, 96; his second book, 2, 18, 39, 40; his letter to Ridley concerning altars, 26
 Elevation, 6, 42
 Elizabeth, Queen, ix, xii, xiii, xvi; her Prayer-Book, 38, 39, 40; her Act of Uniformity, 36
English Churchman, 5
English Historical Review, 86.
 Estcourt, Canon, 73
 Ethiopic Liturgy, 59
 Exhortation in Communion Service, 110
 Fausset, 60
 Field, Bishop, 11
 Forbes, Bishop, "On Articles," xv, 109, 124
 Foreigners, Influence of, 22
 "Formula Concordiæ," ix, xxxi
 Foxe, "Acts and Monuments," xviii, 26, 51, 125
 Fraction, 66
 Frampton, Bishop, xxii
 Frankfort-on-Maine, Assembly at, ix
 Freeman, Archdeacon, 61, 121
 Fulke, 111
 Fuller's "Church History," xxix
 Gallican Liturgy, 59, 61
 Garbett, "Voices of the Ch. of E.," 129, 130
 Gardiner, Bishop, 10, 14, 29, 34, 40, 86.

Gasquet, 3, 4, 5, 6, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 25, 27, 28, 29, 31, 92.
 Gauden, Bishop, 44, 46, 70.
 Geste, Bishop, xxxi, 20, 38, 40.
 Goar, "Euchologion," 59.
 Goode, Dean, xxiii, 49, 51, 52, 60, 108, 130, 131, 133.
 Gorham, "Reformation Gleanings," xiii, 22.
 Goulburn, Dean, 123.
 "Grey Friars' Chronicle," 28.
 Grindal, Archbishop, his letter to magistrates of Frankfort, viii
 his letter to Bullinger, xi, his letter to the Bishops, xx.
 Grueber, 109, 124.
 Guardian, 13, 19, 27, 36, 39, 75, 79.
 Gueste. *See* Geste.
 Gunning, Bishop, 43, 44, 45, 46.
 Hackett, 46.
 Haddon, 126.
 Hall, Bishop, 40, 65.
 Hallam, 118.
 Hammond, Dr. Henry, 83, 127.
 Hammond, "Liturgies," 59, 61.
 Hampton Court Conference, 57.
 "Harmonia Confessionum," xiv, xxv, xxvi, xxvii, xxviii.
 Harrison on Rubrics, 58, 65.
 Hatton, Sir Christopher, xvii.
 Henchman, Bishop, 46.
 Herdesian, 129.
 Hermann of Cologne, 3.
 Hey, Prof., 120.
 Heylyn, xiv, xv, xx, 46, 128.
 Hills, Richard, 8, 16.
 "Historia Comitiorum MDXXX.", 25.
 Hittorpius, 84, 85.
 Homilies, 5.
 Hook's "Lives," 118, 119.
 Hooker, xiii, xiv, xviii, xxxii, xxxiii, xxxiv, 11, 30, 38, 49, 60, 70, 102, 126.
 Hooper, Bishop, 15, 126.
 Horne, Bishop, quoted, x, xii.
 Horsley, Bishop, 89.
 Hospinian, quoted, ix, x, xxxii, 123, 129.
 Howson, Dean, 60.
 Humble Access, Prayer of, 113.
 Humphrey, 108.
 Husband, Rev. E., 112.

Injunctions, Royal, of 1547, 4.
 Irish Prayer-Book of 1551, 14.
 Jacob, "Lutheran Movement in England," 21.
 Jacobson, Bishop, 60, 62, 65, 66, 71.
 Jacobus, Andreas, xi.
 Jenkins, Canon, 81.
 Jenkyns, 23.
 Jewel, Bishop, quoted, x, xii, xxxii, 20, 120, 125.
 Jewish ritual, 94.
 Jonas, Justus, xxvi, 19.
 Kennett, Bishop White, 45, 56, 63, 72.
 Kiss of peace, 109, 124.
 Kneeling reception, 38, 44, 57.
 Knox, Mr. Alexander, 67, 68.
 Kurtz, 38.
 Lake, Dean, 74, 75.
 Latimer, Bishop, 5, 15, 16, 17, 34, 125.
 L'Arroque, 121.
 Laud, Archbishop, xiv, xix, xx, xxii, 11, 127.
 Lay-communion, 83.
 Le Brun, 59.
 Leo Judæ, xviii.
 L'Estrange, 56, 127.
 Liturgies, Ancient, 84; Greek, 20, 61.
 Liturgy, Mozarabic, 19, 20, 61; Armenian, 59; Ambrosian, 59; of St. James, 20; Ethiopic, 59; Gallican, 59; Clementine, 94.
 Lord's Supper—a new term, 5.
 Lorenzana, Archbishop, 59.
 Lorimer, "John Knox," 22, 23, 56.
 Luckock, "Studies," 23, 25, 43, 69.
 Lutheran doctrine of Eucharist, viii, xix, xxv, xxvi, 6, 14, 15, 16, 21, 24, 50, 128.
 Lutherano-Papistical ministry, xii.
 Mabillon, 59.
 Machyn's Diary, xvi, 103.
 Malan, Rev. S., 84, 121, 123.
 Manducation, Oral, xxvi, xxvii, 86.
 Marburg, Conference at, 129.
 Maresius, xxix.
 Marriott, 28.

Marsden, "Hist. of Early Puritans," xxiv

Marshall, Latin Prayer-Book of Charles II., 58, 59, 60

Martene, 59

Martyr, Peter, viii, xiii, 16, 22, 32, 60

Mass, the name, 4, 26; the doctrine, 17, 24, 25, 79, 81, 101, 102, 103

Medd, 97

Melanchthon, 82, 126

Memorial, 12, 13, 25, 90, 91

Middleburgh Prayer-Book, 113, 121

Minister, the term, 58

Μνημόσυνον, 25, 26, 91

Morley, Bishop, 44, 46, 129, 130

Morton, Bishop, 49, 126

Mozarabic Liturgy, 19, 20, 59, 61, 92

Mysteries, 120, 121, 122, 123

Neal, "Hist. of Puritans," xiv, 43, 44, 56, 68, 69

Neale, Dr. M., 59

Newman, Cardinal, 74, 75, 77, 78

Nicholls on "Common Prayer," 37, 42, 68

Nicholson, Bishop, 120, 130

Niemayer, "Collectio Confessionum," xxviii, 129

Norwich, Administration Book, 13

Nowell, Dean, xviii

Nuremberg formularies, 16, 19, 21

Oblation, 13, 60, 61

Œcolampadius, x, xviii, 126

Offertory, 58, 59

O'Kane (of Maynooth), Dr., 9

Omission of doctrine, Argument from, vii

Oral manducation, xxvi, xxvii, 86

"Original Letters" (P.S.), 8, 14, 15

Owen, Dr. John, xiv, 128

Oxford Movement, 75, 76

Palmer, 20, 62

Parker, Archbishop, xix, xxxii

Parker, Mr., 37, 45, 64

Parkhurst, 121

Parsons quoted, x

Passover ritual, 94

Patrick, Bishop, 12, 60

Pearson, 46

Perkins, xiv

Perry, "Declaration on Kneeling," 23, 44

Perry, "Hist. of Ch. of Eng.," 58

Petley, 58

Pfaff, 60

Philpot, 126

Pierson. *See* Pearson

Pius IV., Creed of, 80

Pius V., his Bull of Excommunication, xii

Pocock, 63, 86

Pole, Cardinal, 80

Potter, Archbishop, xiv

Prayer for Church Militant, 61

Preface to Prayer-Book, 69, 72

Presbyter, 58

Presence, Real, xxxiii, 48, 49, 50, 54, 83, 124, 126

Presence, Corporal, 48, 50, 54, 57, 125, 126, 132

Priest, 58

Privy Council, Acts of, 10

Privy Council, Judgment of, 48, 51

Probst, Dr., 94

Prynn, "Canterbury's Doom," xx

Puritans, xxiv, xxv

Pusey, Dr., 124, 133

Rathram, 121

Real Presence. *See* Presence

"Reformatio Legum," xix

Revision of 1662, 44, 57, 63, 68

Reynolds, Bishop, 49, 110, 129, 130

Ridley, Bishop, 12, 17, 26, 39, 125

Robertson, Canon, 37, 59.

Rogers on "Articles," xiii, xvii

Romish Church, Newman's judgment of, 77, 78

Rubric, Black, 38, 40, 44, 51, 53, 57, 124, 129, 131, 132

Rupertus Tuitiensis, 84

Sacerdos, 58

Sacrifice, Eucharistic, 65, 108

Sadolet, 80

Sancroft, Archbishop, 41, 58, 65

Sanders quoted, xiii

Sanderson, Bishop, 46, 63, 72

"Sarum Missal," 3, 6, 66

Savoy Conference, 44, 45, 46, 58, 63, 83, 108, 129

Savoy, Duke of, xx, xxi

Scambler, Bishop, xvii

Schaff, xxvi, xxvii, xxviii, xxix
 Schulting, Cornelius, 31
 Schwenkfeldian doctrine, xxviii, 30
 Scotch Liturgy, 65, 72
 Scotland, Prayer-Book for, 28
 Scott, Bishop, 20
 Scottish Episcopal Church, 89
 Scudamore, 20, 28, 58, 59, 60, 61, 65,
 91
 Seckendorf, 82
 Secker, Archbishop, 57, 122, 130
 Selborne, Lord, 33, 37, 45, 46, 71
 Seripandi, 80
 Sharp, Archbishop, 89
 Sheldon, Archbishop, 44, 46, 58, 129
 Simmon's "Lay Folks' Mass-Book,"
 59, 65
 Skene, Dr., 94
 Smalcaldic League, the, xii
 Soames, "Elizabethan History," xii
 Spanish Calendar, xv
 Sparrow, 46
 St. Andrews, Bishop of, 52, 62
 "State Papers," 20
 Stephens, Dr., 13
 Sterne, 46
 Strype quoted, xi, xiv, xv, xxi, 38, 51
 Stubbs, Bishop, 36
 Swainson, Professor, 20
 Synusiasts, xvii, xxxii

Table, 26, 27, 103, 104
 Taylor, Bishop Jeremy, 49, 108, 126
 Tenison, Archbishop, 56, 68
 Thirlby, Bishop, 13, 14
 Thirlwall, Bishop, 89, 123, 133
 Thorndike, 11, 42, 49
 Tomlinson, "Great Debate," 4, 5,
 14, 39
 "Tracts for the Times," 103
 Trent, Council of, 20, 80
 Trower, Bishop, 51

Tunstall, Bishop, 14, 80
 Turretin, 42
 Turton, 123

Ubiquitaries, xi, xvii, xxxii
 Uniformity, the Act of, (1559), 36,
 38, 40
 — (1662), 38, 58
 Ursinus, 111, 121, 128

Vestments, 27, 28, 32

Wake, Archbishop, xv, 12, 42, 48, 49,
 55, 112, 122, 126, 127, 131
 Walton, "Rubrical Determination,"
 14, 27, 41, 64, 65
 Walton, Isaac, "Life of Sander-
 son," 63
 Warren, 19, 27, 59, 62
 Waterland, 11, 61, 90, 91, 130
 Westminster Confession, xxix, 11, 49,
 129

Westminster Directory, 113
 Wheatley, 68
 Whitaker, quoted, xvi, 121
 White, Alexander, xvi
 Whitgift, Archbishop, quoted as to
 rejection of Real Presence by the
 Church of England, viii, 32; as to
 religion of Geneva, xxi
 Wittemberg Order, the, 6
 Woodhead, Abraham, 48, 53, 55
 Wordsworth, Bishop Charles, 52, 62,
 89, 120, 121
 Wren, Bishop, 28, 45, 60, 62, 64, 66,
 73
 Wriothesley's "Chronicle," xvi, 4

Zanchius, xiii
 "Zurich Letters," xii, xvi, xxxii.
 Zwinglian doctrine, x, xxxiii, 30





D00729301M

Date Due

NOV 21 '58	MAY 8 1959		
DE			
DEC 4 '58			
MAR 19 '59			
DEC 28			
NOV 05			

000729301M



LSG-DUKE